

NPPA

NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION

Journal

Volume 6

April 1960

Number 2

Responsibility of Business and Industry for Employing Offenders

C. R. BECHTOL, MELVILLE MONHEIMER, J. E. NOLAN, AND P. J. SEVENICH*

Members, Washington Citizens Council, National Probation and Parole Association

PLEASE, can you help me get a job?" That was the question most often raised when we talked with inmates in our tours of correctional institutions in Washington. We were encouraged to mingle with the prisoners and to attend their group discussion meetings. In addition, a number of us individually made special trips to the institutions for meetings and interviews with inmates.

Of course, we heard many trivial complaints resembling those our sons had against the armed services. When we got down to serious thinking, however, we found that the number one concern of the prisoner was not how soon he would get out but rather how he could get a job and keep himself out.

* C. R. Bechtol is Personnel Director, Kenworth Motor Truck Co., Seattle; Melville Monheimer is an attorney in Seattle; J. E. Nolan is Vice-President and General Counsel, Weyerhaeuser Timber Company, Tacoma; P. J. Sevenich is the owner (retired) of the Sevenich Motor Company, Everett.

The parole board here, as in most states, usually insists on an employment plan, entailing a definite job offer, before releasing a prisoner on parole. In our state, parole caseloads are so large that new parolees without definite job plans would not be adequately supervised during the crucial three-month period after release.

No Job, No Hope

We have to confess that before joining the Washington Citizens Council of NPPA, we thought the only thing the released offender had to do was to stay out of trouble and away from bad influences. When inmates asked us how long we thought we could remain out if we were in their place and had no job to go to, we found ourselves without an answer.

The following comment from an inmate who was serving his full sentence because he didn't have a definite prospect of employment is a reality to reckon with:

"When I leave, the state will give me about \$40 and a suit of clothes. That's all I will have. No home. No job. I may have to steal to get by. I start and once you've started, what's the use of stopping?"

Every member of our Council—industrialists, labor leaders, professional men, and civic leaders—has received appeals—touching appeals—from prisoners saying they were eligible for parole and needed our help to find employment. The feeling of inmates, who have to give the prison as their return address in writing to a prospective employer, is best summed up by the opening sentence of one such letter. "Seeking employment from a penitentiary is embarrassing. As you can see, I am a convict at the state prison. I hope this doesn't shock you too much." The testimony of prison and parole officials and our own experience as recipients of such letters tell us that many employers are a bit shocked in these instances.

Inmates told us that requests addressed to prospective employers frequently met with polite refusals, even for an interview, and at times with an emphatic statement of "not interested" or worse. The officials at the institutions with whom we talked all said that an inmate seldom obtained employment by writing from the prison to prospective employers. Unless he was given a job by a relative or friend or someone used "influence" to line up a job, his prospect for an early release was not good. Often the jobs lined up "in order to get out" were makeshifts. Probation and parole officers told us of the difficulties in trying to persuade employers to hire probationers and parolees "sight unseen."

Regarding parolees released without jobs, the following letter to one of our Council members is fairly typical:

"As yet I haven't found any work. The company won't take me back. I have enough money for food to carry me through for about a week. All I know is that in my heart I don't want to steal anything or be sent back to the reformatory because I know what it will do to me. I'm sure that very few men want to go back or steal. Most of us just want to live and work like anyone else. But as things are, many are going back almost every day.

"A man will get to a point where all reason goes out the window and desperation and chance take its place. My desires and those of others like me are no different from those of any other man on the street. We want a job and security. We are willing to work like anyone else in the world if we have a chance. We have families to support, too.

"So many feel we are no good because of a record—yet we fight for our country and would gladly give our life for it if need be. We need to work, eat, and sleep like anyone else, but how many will give us the chance? Very few, as you know yourself. As far as most people are concerned, one bad egg makes all of us smell the same.

"True, a great deal, maybe 99 per cent, is up to us; yet the other one per cent can be the turning point, 'the chance,' the chance to make good. Some day, I hope, people will understand. We ask no more, we expect no more, than anyone else, if given a chance to prove ourselves.

"I got a little carried away with myself here. Please forgive me.

"I am thankful for what you and many others are doing for us because

it g
This
Pr
ber
caref
told
of th
mem
teres
emph
suad
It
effect
dustr
stood
tivity
sent
tions

As
inal
into
priso
parol
Help
the
you s
of cr
We
the c
offen
of ca
marr
was c
port

We
thous
in ou
taxpa
and
much
provi
tution
offen
fare p
revea
a year

it gives us all hope for the future. This should have happened long ago."

Prior to his appointment, one member of the Council had been hiring carefully selected offenders, and he told us of his satisfaction in a number of them who had made good. Other members of the Council became interested and "fell in line" by either employing released offenders or persuading business friends to hire them.

It became apparent that the most effective approach to business and industry was the language they understood—dollars and cents and productivity. Several of our members represent the largest taxpaying organizations in the state.

What We Learned

As taxpayers, we converted the original time served and returns to prison into the cost of crime. Shorten the prison term with a well-functioning parole system and you reduce the cost. Help a released offender stay out of the institution he has just left and you substantially reduce the total cost of crime.

We learned that the average cost for the care and treatment of an adult offender was \$1,650 a year. The cost of care and treatment of the average married offender at the reformatory was over \$6,000 a year, including support of his family and loss of wages.

We found that there were about a thousand more inmates than need be in our institutions, that this cost the taxpayers over \$5,000 a day for care and maintenance alone, and that much of this could be saved by improving probation, parole, and institutional services and seeing that fewer offenders returned. The public welfare people made a study for us which revealed that it cost over \$1 million a year for the care of families of in-

mates under the Aid to Dependent Children program.

We found in our studies that a number of offenders served "life sentences on the installment plan," with frequent returns for violations and new offenses. Frequently mentioned was the problem of employment refusals, followed by a "striking out." A number of these "life-of-crime" cases cost the public over \$100,000 each.

Our Council was shocked by the tremendous cost of crime. The estimate of the annual total cost of crime in our state is about \$300 million, which is paid for by losses from theft of our property, by increased insurance premiums, and by personal and business taxes. According to J. Edgar Hoover the annual national bill for crime is \$22 billion, a staggering sum exceeded only by national defense spending.

The wardens told us that "occupationally handicapped" offenders constituted one of the largest groups in the institution. With inmate idleness widespread and the vocational and industrial programs in the correctional institutions a long way from adequate, the Council first centered its attention on this problem.

Council reports to the public—"Delinquency and Crime Are Your Business" and "Your Problem Is Our Problem"—helped bring about awareness of the public's responsibility for our number one social problem—delinquency and crime.

In 1957, mainly as a result of support from labor, lined up by our Council—support which the correctional leaders apparently had not sought in the past—a bill establishing the first mandatory state-use system was passed, with budgetary appropri-

ations for setting up new industries. We are most happy to say that the institutions have considerably improved their services and facilities for teaching trades and skills to inmates. Idleness has been reduced considerably—previously over half of the inmates were idle—and will be completely eliminated during this biennium with the addition of more vocational and industrial programs.

We found, however, that it was useless to train prisoners unless job openings could be obtained for them. A survey of businesses and industries throughout the state, conducted with the excellent help of the state probation and parole staff, revealed that most offenders were employed by the smaller and medium-sized firms. The larger businesses and industries were not carrying their share of the load. To us they seemed to be the "naturals" for absorbing some of the offenders, at least a fair share.

The Council also learned that some of the labor organizations were not helping offenders on problems of union membership, job placement, etc. One of our members was the president of the State Labor Council. He began intensive work with the unions. In addition to talking with union leaders personally, he placed each union on our mailing list for Council reports to the public. Union conferences began featuring talks by correctional leaders. By working with the unions on this basis, he was able to interest their business agents in offenders so that they helped bring about job placements. (We learned, incidentally, that the business agent is a key man in helping place offenders on jobs, perhaps more so than the probation and parole officer in some cases.)

The Council realized, however, that it could not do the job alone. Business, industry, and labor as a whole had to be made aware of their stake in solving the problem. We were certain they would assume their proper responsibility if our findings and conclusions could be brought vividly to their attention.

After we discussed this with Governor Albert D. Rosellini, he called the Governor's Conference on the Employment of Offenders for February 18-19, 1960, at which leaders of business, industry, labor, employment agencies, bonding companies, and other interested groups throughout the state would get together with correctional officials for an exchange of ideas.[†]

Governor's Conference

Erle Stanley Gardner (mystery writer, attorney, and founder of the "Court of Last Resort") accepted the invitation to be the banquet speaker. Robert Bailey, National Operations Manager, Clark Equipment Company, Brown Trailer Division, Michigan City, Ind., accepted the invitation to be the main speaker for business and industry. The State Labor Council president will be the keynoter for labor. Governor Rosellini, long interested in the betterment of services for dealing with offenders, said he would open the conference. Leaders of business and industry, distinguished jurists, top state and federal prison officials, and probation and parole executives agreed to serve on various panels.

The conference is expected to be a "two-way-street." Business and labor

[†] For a summary of what happened at the conference, which took place after this manuscript was sent to the printer, see the Postscript by Joseph R. Rowan, NPPA's Washington Citizens Council consultant, on p. 135.

leaders will give the benefit of their experience to their fellow citizens and to the probation and parole officers regarding problems in hiring offenders; also they will acquaint the institutional officials with their thinking on the kind of training that inmates should be given to prepare them for better employment.

Participants will be given realistic and vivid information on offenders. Council members, particularly one with over twenty years of experience in hiring offenders and placing them with other employers in the community, are convinced that the problem of providing employment for offenders stems mainly from the fact that they are labeled as offenders. The offender is generally shunned because of the mystery surrounding him. Therefore we set up a panel on "Who Is the Offender?"

Other panel topics:

"What Are Institutions Now Doing to Prepare Offender-Employees?"

"What Must Government Do to Better Prepare Offender-Employees?"

"What about Hiring Offenders?"

"What Can Business and Labor Do to Help Develop Greater Employment for Offenders?"

In these panel presentations, conference participants will learn that offenders do not have horns and that FBI agents-in-training cannot distinguish photographs of men with criminal records from those of members of previous FBI training classes. They will hear employers with many years of experience in hiring offenders testify that they generally have had as good success with properly selected offenders as with the regular run of employees.

Employers—well aware of the problems of absenteeism and alcoholism

with nonoffenders—will learn that they can know more about the offender-employee than about the non-offender, because of the information supplied by probation and parole officers. They will learn that supervised offenders generally have an incentive to "make good"—they must show the officials they are on the job. Their incentive is generally summed up in the statement an inmate made in writing to one of our personnel people: "My sole objective upon release is to be reunited with my family and to do a superior job for my employer. I am perfectly willing to accept anything you have to offer. I won't let you or your firm down if I'm given this opportunity to work."

They will hear experienced employers say that probationers and parolees are eager to compete with other employees on an equal footing, that they are loyal to the employer who gives them a chance to make good. "Knowing that you are not prejudiced against a man in my predicament means more to me than words can express." This sentence, in a letter to one of us recently, portrays the feeling an offender is likely to carry with him to the job.

Employers will learn that the key to success in hiring an offender is placing him in the job for which he is best suited; if he isn't so placed, he is as liable to fail as the poorly placed nonoffender is.

Upon calling the conference, Governor Rosellini said that employers attending would not be plagued by probation and parole officers to provide jobs thereafter. Our only immediate goal is to get them to the conference.

The co-chairmen of the conference are members of the Washington Cit-

izens Council: one is the personnel manager of a large industrial plant in Seattle, and the other is the top labor leader in the state. We expect about 150 leaders of business, industry, labor, and government to participate. We are certain that from this conference will come recommendations for a permanent organization of citizens to do what is essentially a citizens' job. The Council hopes that the conference will lead to a program somewhat as follows:

1. Local citizens committees, comprised mainly of management and labor, to be established to work on offender-employment problems.

2. Committees in communities where correctional institutions are located to work with the superintendents to help train inmates properly, somewhat as done by the Trade Advisory Committees in California.

3. Committees to cooperate with state and federal probation, parole, and employment personnel; to work through and with them, not to supplant them.

4. Appointment of a statewide citizens coordinating committee by the governor to assist local committees, whose experience—good as well as bad—will be communicated to one another.

5. Follow through with underwriters to lower the "roadblock" created by fidelity bonds.

6. Help establish new methods and techniques, some now being tried in other states, such as "halfway" houses for parolees, furloughs for prisoners to find jobs, etc.

Good Business

No properly managed business or industry hires more men than it needs, and we do not ask or expect any to employ offenders as surplus personnel.

We do ask companies—particularly the larger ones, who can do much to alleviate the problem—to hire them when they present acceptable qualifications and useful skills. Even some businesses that have to be highly selective can fill some of their needs from the ranks of offender applicants. A survey at the adult institutions in Washington last year showed that the inmates came from all walks of life and had a wide range of occupational skills.

Some employers are reluctant to hire offenders who have a record of property offenses—theft, larceny, burglary, etc.—because of the consequent risk. We do not lightly dismiss their fears, but certainly they should realize that, in the mass, employing the nonoffender is also not without risk. According to reliable estimates, employee thefts in retail and wholesale businesses—self-determined bonuses not reported to law-enforcement agencies—amount to over \$1 billion a year, more than double the \$479 million reported to police in 1958 as stolen. The depredations involved in this widespread custom of the unannounced dividend—a form of "take home" income not itemized on the payroll—are made good mainly by bonding companies.

If you're running a business you have to make a profit. You hire an offender just as you would anyone else—because he can help you make a profit, not because you surrender to sentimentality or pity. We are realistic; we know that not every offender who goes back to prison would have stayed out if he had had a job. We have had enough experience collectively, however, to know that, in a large number of cases, job placement instead of job rebuff has meant

the
and
U
the
them
waste
now
none
is vi
stall
obsta
whil

Be
of th
Emp
Seati
like
abov
"We
busi
men
ence
Seati
ance
that
the

Th
abou
mate
else
woul

Go
open
pres
a ple
to a
towa
Erle
myst

the difference between staying out and going back.

Unless offenders are assimilated in the community in jobs best suited for them, prisons will continue to be the wasteful "revolving door" systems they now are, systems under which many nondangerous offenders serve what is virtually a life sentence on the installment plan—largely because of the obstacles in the way of stable, worthwhile employment.

We are certain that when our fellow citizens involved in the Governor's Conference are given the full story, as we have witnessed it, they will devise plans to meet the unemployment problem. When industry and labor are made aware of their stake in crime control, they will assume their responsibility. Surely they will conclude that it is more economical to hire an offender than to support him.

Postscript

JOSEPH R. ROWAN

Consultant, NPPA Washington Citizens Council

Before summarizing the proceedings of the Governor's Conference on the Employment of Offenders, held in Seattle on February 18-19, I should like to amend a statistic in the article above. The authors said (page 134): "We expect about 150 leaders of business, industry, labor, and government to participate." In its conference news story on February 19, the *Seattle Times* reported actual attendance as 235 (and I might emphasize that that figure held up throughout the conference).

The attendance figure was just about the only thing that didn't match our expectations; everything else developed as we had thought it would.

Governor Albert D. Rosellini opened the conference with a graphic presentation of the costs of crime and a plea to business, industry, and labor to apply their combined experience toward a solution of the problem. Erle Stanley Gardner, attorney and mystery story writer, emphasized the

crucial importance of staffing probation and parole systems adequately and lauded the Citizen Action Program movement.

The two business-industry and labor keynoters outlined, realistically and spiritedly, the problems their groups would have to face. The subsequent exchange of ideas was, as predicted, extremely fruitful.

The participants recommended that "businesslike" applications for employment by inmates be submitted to employers, replacing the handwritten, rambling, frequently begging-for-mercy letters sent by inmates. They recommended that the application contain a summary of the offender's background, education, experience, etc., and that institutional and parole personnel assist inmates in making these applications.

Three recently discharged parolees took an active part in the discussion and formulation of recommendations. They used their real names, discussed their backgrounds freely, and made

positive presentations. When they spoke, "you could hear a pin drop," not so much out of awe for the change in their lives¹ as out of respect for their proposals on the subject at hand. Holding that many offenders "wasted away their time in prison" and that "many of them would listen to business, industry, and labor," they urged that representatives of these groups assist institutional personnel with the orientation of newly admitted offenders during the admission and classification period—something not done anywhere now—and that these leaders play an even more active role in helping institutional and parole personnel with the orientation of prospective parolees who would soon, on release, be facing employment problems.

Other recommendations dealt with the need for (1) development of a more diversified prison industries program and more trade and apprenticeship training (a skilled worker has a better chance than one unskilled or semi-skilled) and (2) appointment of more probation and parole officers (to speed up help for offenders in locating jobs and to provide more adequate counseling and guidance).

A sampling of opinion by members of the Washington Citizens Council, after the meeting, showed that representatives of business, industry, labor, and the professions—most of them not previously exposed to correctional issues—generally described the conference as "an eye opener," "greatly revealing," "long overdue," and "something which really convinced us that

we must take a more active part in this field."

The conference was given extensive radio, television, and press coverage. One of the leading newspapers carried three separate stories in one edition, with the lead article on the front page.

The following resolution, calling for the governor to appoint a state commission on the employment of offenders, was passed unanimously and enthusiastically. It marked the end of the conference and, we are confident, the beginning of a new approach by state government to the handling of offenders:

Whereas one of the primary purposes of confining an offender is to rehabilitate him as an individual so that upon release he may become a useful and accepted member of society;

Whereas it is the consensus of this Conference that without employment for the offender on release, reconfine-ment is almost certain, notwithstanding the high level of institutional training and treatment or the efforts of qualified probation and parole services;

Whereas lack of employment opportunities has been a major contributing cause to the high rate of recidivism and in turn to the increasing rate and cost of crime and delinquency; and

Whereas business, industry, and labor have not only a substantial financial interest in reducing the increasing rate and cost of crime, but, as important components of society, an obligation to make a material contribution to solving the problem of employment of offenders;

Be It Resolved that the Conference on Employment of Offenders called

¹ For example, one of them, fifty years old, a "seven-time loser" who had spent eighteen years in prisons, is now the superintendent of a wood-products company in Washington.

by the Honorable Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of the State of Washington, in cooperation with the Washington Citizens Council of the National Probation and Parole Association and the Institutional Industries Commission recommends to the Governor that he appoint a state commission on the employment of offenders to obtain the counsel and advice of business, labor, and industry, to inform and acquaint the public with the necessity of providing employment for offenders and to advise the correctional institutions on the training of offenders to meet the needs of the available labor market and the abilities of the individual

offender and to develop effective procedures for assisting offenders in finding employment;

That this state commission be authorized to establish local commissions within appropriate geographical areas;

That the state and local commissions shall consult with existing institutions and departments which are responsible for administration of the state's correctional laws and institutions; and

That each commission shall have co-chairmen who shall be representatives of labor and either industry or business.

Labor's Position on the Employment of Offenders

LEO PERLIS

Director, Community Service Activities, AFL-CIO

WHAT is organized labor's attitude on the employment of offenders?

The executive of a New York City correctional agency reports: "From first-hand observation we know that many labor men have shown remarkable sympathy for and understanding of the plight of the man who has been in conflict with the law. In many instances we have seen labor leaders do a great deal to promote the employment of offenders, actually having to defend their position in various community areas outside of labor circles."

Responding to the same question, the executive of another New York City correctional agency declared: "Unions are primarily concerned with their own problems and not especially interested in offenders even if they are former or present union members. Labor unions do not appear to be really interested in the employment of offenders."

Which statement is true? Does labor care about the rehabilitation and re-employment of offenders? Does labor have a stake in the question? Or, is labor jealously guarding its own home ground by shutting out the offender from trade union membership?

Obviously, the first agency executive was able to work well with labor in job placement, while the other one got nowhere.

Why was this? What factors enter into labor's role in this social prob-

lem? What is the true position of organized labor on offenders?

Let's examine the facts.

The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations has not issued any official policy statement on the employment of offenders; nevertheless, its position, in theory at least, can be found in some of the basic beliefs of labor.

Discussing labor's community services program, AFL-CIO President George Meany has said: "As the union member is first and foremost a citizen of his community, so the objective of the trade union movement is inseparably tied to the welfare of all the people."

Discussing social welfare, the AFL-CIO Executive Council has stated: "Assistance in whatever form should be given on the basis of need, regardless of the cause of the need and without regard to race, color, or national origin."

These statements surely are not consistent with the charge that the AFL-CIO seeks to make second-class citizens of offenders.

A foundation of the labor movement has been and always will be a strong belief in the dignity of the individual.

"The Man Who Lived Again"

In fact, the AFL-CIO implemented its concern for the offender in November, 1957, when its Community Services department published a leaflet

on understanding and helping the released prisoner. Entitled "The Man Who Lived Again," the leaflet was done in cooperation with the American Correctional Association. AFL-CIO Community Services has distributed more than 50,000 copies of the leaflet to national, state, and local labor groups.

Outlining the problem and underscoring the importance of community acceptance, the leaflet points out:

More community groups must be encouraged to take a greater interest in the work and management of local and state correctional institutions, for the rehabilitation and readjustment of the released person is a community responsibility. It cannot be left alone to correctional authorities.

This, then, provides another indication of the top-level thinking of organized labor on the problem of the offender. It would seem to constitute the position in theory of the AFL-CIO.

In actual practice, however, labor's role in the offender picture is not so clearly drawn. In many communities, union groups are working with correctional agencies in a positive, concrete fashion. In others, the attitude of labor is reportedly negative. And in still others, where labor pays little heed to the problem and social agencies admittedly give scant attention to the resources of the trade unions around them, no attitude at all is discernible.

In order to obtain a critical evaluation of labor's part in the placement of offenders at the state and local levels, AFL-CIO Community Service Activities recently surveyed the thirty-two member agencies of the International Prisoners Aid Association. We asked each agency to describe any work it has done with labor groups in

securing placement, to characterize labor's attitude, to state the problems that have arisen in connection with any joint endeavors involving labor and the agency, and to make general comments or observations on the subject.

Many responses were encouraging. Some were disappointing. All were informative.

One of the most gratifying replies came from Richard A. McGee, California's Director of Corrections, who outlined the structure of the full-scale labor-management cooperative approach now operating in his state. Mr. McGee reports: "About 600 management and labor officials are included in the organization of some sixty trade advisory committees operating on a trade-by-trade basis. Although their assistance in obtaining jobs for parolees is strictly voluntary, we have found through experience that the committees have been a great help. As you know it is always difficult to trace the source of such help, but we feel that about 20 per cent of our placements can be traced to some type of help given by either management or labor people or the committees. Because of the nature and status of collective bargaining in California, many industries depend on referrals from unions, so the assistance in these cases is quite direct."

Mr. McGee characterizes labor's assistance as "splendid."

Labor Criticized

On the other side of the ledger, the United Prison Association of Massachusetts in the November, 1959 issue of its publication, *Correctional Research*, points out: "Experienced correctional administrators have frequently expressed the opinion that

organized labor, as a whole, has not been cooperative, although individual unions have helped."

The publication offers a quote from an article by Manuel Lopez-Rey, Chief of the Social Defense Section of the United Nations Secretariat: "The question is not whether trade unions may occasionally accept some ex-prisoners but whether they are not supposed to do nowadays something more than protecting the wages or benefits of their own members."

John F. Fitzgerald, Executive Director of the Massachusetts prison association, responding to our survey, cited "The many archaic regulations which restrict the development of a sound industrial and vocational training system within our institutions." He held that labor must be prone to the further development of industry within institutions before a re-evaluation of industrial programs can be realized. "Actually, the criticism toward labor seems to be that they are not prepared to hire the ex-prisoner and that developments within our prison industrial programs are handicapped by the attitude of labor and management," he added.

In this last statement, Mr. Fitzgerald makes an error that is often made by correctional and social welfare agencies in dealing with labor groups on job placement.

The employee is not hired by the union; he is hired by the employer.

Labor can expedite, encourage, and cooperate with the employer in the practice of hiring, but we must not forget that the ultimate decision—and responsibility—rests with management.

A hopeful note was sounded in the survey by a reply from James W. Curran, Superintendent of Prisons in Maryland, who states that there has

been "a rather distinct modification of the hostile attitudes employers of labor and representatives of organized labor evinced in the past in regard to the provision of employment opportunities to ex-prisoners." He sees the trend as having "significant benefit for the ex-prisoners who really want an opportunity to make a successful adjustment to community life."

Richard G. Jobe, Executive Director of the Dayton, Ohio, Prisoners' Aid Society, outlines a successful working relationship with his local building trades group and states his feeling that "labor takes the attitude that the individual should be judged on the basis of his individual ability and past work record without particular attention to his arrest record or correctional history." He writes: "Long before the existence of our organization formally, the president of our local building trades council had been placing men on the job personally. He was the driving force behind the formation of our organization and has continued his interest and support up to the present time. He has asked all the locals under his jurisdiction to become members of our Society and has them help us whenever possible. His help has been immeasurable."

A specific example of how a state body was able to utilize union and management resources effectively was cited by Leonard R. Witt, Supervisor of Parole Placement for the New York State Executive Department's Division of Parole. He reports: "There have been continuing efforts by the Division of Parole to utilize available union facilities, resources, and general 'know-how' to develop adequate training and job programs for inmates. For example, in the Capitol District Area,

the Jo
for she
the
Sheet
and th
nation
agreed
recom
role,
appre
basis."

Car
ferrals
ing re
Jewish
York
busin
standi
report
the ag
partm
over t
our re
tion
confid
union
the s
quires
the la
progr
been
readil
agent

A
Weis
tacted
place
Cal
"so m
never
Weis
dustr
really
mark
Ri
joins

the Joint Apprenticeship Committee for sheet metal workers, representing the Capitol District Roofing and Sheet Metal Contractors Association, and the Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Local 83, have agreed to accept qualified inmates, recommended by the Division of Parole, for placement as sheet metal apprentice workers on a continuing basis."

Sound Referrals Helpful

Care and selectivity in making referrals have paid off in a good working relationship with labor for the Jewish Family Service agency of New York City. The general attitude of business agents has been "quite understanding" and "very cooperative," reports Morris H. Weiss, Director of the agency's Social Rehabilitation Department. "They have come to realize over the years that we are selective in our referrals and bring to their attention only people in whom we have confidence. We bring to the particular union only those people who have the skill involved in the work required. Since these placements over the last ten years during which this program has been in operation have been so successful, we have been readily able to return to these business agents with new referrals."

A major problem besetting Mr. Weiss and virtually every agency contacted in the survey deals with job placement for the unskilled.

Calling attention to the fact that "so many in the offender group have never developed a valuable skill," Mr. Weiss voices concern that "prison industry itself is not so organized as to really help with the development of marketable skills."

Richard G. Jobe, quoted above, joins in with: "I only wish we could

find more opportunities for unskilled laborers who are willing to work so that they can take care of their own needs and their families without having to rely on welfare assistance."

Mr. Lopez-Rey, again in the November, 1959 issue of *Correctional Research*, takes labor to task on this subject, leveling the charge that trade unions fear the competition by prison labor and therefore hamper the development of skills. "It is rather pathetic," he says, "to see powerful labor organizations trying to prevent or to reduce to insignificant proportions the rehabilitation of prisoners through constructive work. Apparently, for the unions, making bags, brushes, and tags is good enough for the rehabilitation of offenders."

Without going into the question of whether labor is big or small, powerful or weak, we cannot ignore or minimize the point; namely, the primary concern of organized labor is job security, wages, hours, and conditions of work. Certainly, the major consideration of any union is and should be its own membership. But to suggest that labor is concerned *only* with its own members at the expense of other citizens contradicts the entire history and philosophy of the American labor movement.

Society Blamed

The real culprit here is not organized labor, but rather a society which permits unemployment, layoffs, and idleness. Even in the face of these things, labor, generally speaking, is anxious to assist offenders in training and job placement.

On a visit to Chino in California several years ago I myself saw trade unionists helping prisoners to learn skills and crafts. In addition, our sur-

vey uncovered a concrete example which refutes Mr. Lopez-Rey's charge that labor basically wants to hurt the rehabilitation process for selfish reasons.

Isaac Gurman, Executive Director of the St. Louis Bureau for Men, reports: "We have found union officers most helpful in the recent reorganization of our local Workhouse. In 1954 I was commissioned by the mayor of St. Louis to study the Workhouse. On the basis of the findings of this survey certain reorganization was deemed necessary. The Workhouse, other than a quarry which was seldom used, had no work program. We organized a committee whose membership consisted of executives of small manufactories, supervisors from the Board of Education in the industrial arts, and labor leaders. While we found at the beginning a natural reluctance to encourage a competitive labor field, when the union officials saw the idleness in the institution and what that idleness meant, they were most helpful, and in fact, the most insistent members of the committee that work be found for the inmates of the Workhouse. We now have the nucleus of a good work program functioning, and organized labor together with management can take justifiable pride in this effort."

Mr. Lopez-Rey contends that a comparison of the output of prison labor and that of free industry in a given country leads to the conclusion that competition "does not exist or is quite insignificant." Obviously, he chooses to blind himself to the fact that our federal and state institutions alone currently have a total of 205,643 prisoners—a sizable work force that would have a profound effect on our

economy if it were to compete with any given industry.

Correctional agencies as well as labor groups need a clearer perspective on the whole program of in-prison training. Somehow, whenever the question is discussed, the focus is always on the production of consumer goods and commodities. Does the development of occupational skills begin and end with merchandise or services that are salable on the open market?

Experimental Approach Needed

If this initial obstacle of utter concentration on products could be overcome, the problem could be attacked in a broader, more enlightened fashion with an emphasis on new, advanced educational and training practices.

Complete absorption with the production of sales items is simply traveling a new rut in an old highway.

Let's take a new road.

Mr. Gurman states in his survey report: "We have always found that it is the total man that was of interest to trade unions."

Let's look, then, beyond the immediate and familiar to the new and untried—to the total picture in the development of training programs for prisoners.

One of the most thought-provoking and significant survey returns came to us from Sol Tropp, Director of Employment Placement and Special Services for the Kings County (Brooklyn, N.Y.) Probation Department, who related labor's attitude toward the offender to the more complex problem of developing in the whole community a climate of acceptance of the offender. He regards the negative attitude of the total community as "the greatest obstacle" to the rehabilitation of the offender. Mr. Tropp declares: "Of all

the g
with,
mos
towa
porti
250 p
unio
more
they

He
ment
as a
obje
to en
tive,
sible
who
the v
the u
of ou
speci
a pr
to do
tion
refer
work
treat
the s
men.
does
for h
much
tect
a res
belon
whic
confi
impo
tialit

He
grou
of th

In
of co
poin
who

the groups I have come in contact with, I found union representatives are most understanding and sympathetic toward the offender. A substantial portion of our placements of about 250 per annum are made through the unions. Perhaps union people are more accepting of offenders because they are closer to the common man."

He compares labor's and management's attitudes toward the offender as a new employee: "Our primary objective has been to refer our people to employers whose attitudes are positive, and we attempt as much as possible to avoid referrals to employers who are unaccepting and hostile. On the whole, I will say unequivocally, the unions have been most accepting of our clients and showed them extra special attention. What is more, when a probationer is sent by the unions to do a job, almost never is any mention made of his probation status. The referrals through the unions usually work out better because the client is treated as an equal and starts off on the same footing with all other union men. In addition, where an employer doesn't know of his record, the chance for his success on the job is usually much better. Finally, the unions protect the rights of our clients, who, as a result, develop a greater sense of belonging and a feeling of security which gives them a certain degree of confidence in themselves. This is so important in developing their potentialities."

Here, indeed, is evidence that labor groups are concerned with the plight of the offender.

In studying the need for a climate of community acceptance, we should point out that in dealing with those who have violated society's code, we

must also work with society. Suspicions and feelings of prejudice must be eliminated.

Discrimination

Before society can expect a transformation in the behavior of an offender, it must change its own attitude. We would never expect the mentally ill person to get better if he were subjected to the same pressures which finally caused his breakdown. Why, then, does society demand this of the offender?

Many factors in our present-day society serve to complicate the issue of employment for the offender. He suffers most in a period of scarcity. He is the last to be hired and the first to be laid off. In jobs involving the handling of money and in jobs where security is important, the offender suffers.

On this last point, pertinent information is provided by Robert R. Hannum, Director of Vocational Placement for New York's Osborne Association, who writes: "Very few unions here or elsewhere seem to worry much about the fact of a criminal record, whether it be juvenile or adult. Usually such discrimination is caused by some other agency or agencies related to a given occupation, whether it be skilled or unskilled. I am thinking of the civil service unions throughout the United States who, if they discriminate against people with illegal backgrounds, do so because the civil service commissions, not the unions themselves, put up the barrier. And then one might think of the enormous family of unions related to the National Security Program. As examples, I would mention the Merchant Marine or unions covering all types of skills in the avia-

tion factories all over the country. Since the contractor (the U.S. Government) takes the fingerprints of employees and asks the \$64 question on the employee's application form or in a separate form, the ex-inmate who presents himself for employment has a difficulty. But this is not the union's fault. If he has to admit that he was convicted of more than one felony, or was found guilty of a morals felony, conspiracy against the government, or of any violation of the narcotics laws whether it be sale, use, or possession, our experience shows he may not hope to be passed upon by the security agency which works along with the defense industries personnel program."

Another factor that applies directly to organized labor is the public image of labor racketeers, an image used as a weapon against honest trade unions by many forces in our society. It goes without saying that this dark blanket of condemnation covering all decent unionism has made labor sensitive in its dealings with offenders.

Robin L. Lamson, Executive Director of the Wisconsin Service Association, informs us that "the only real problem in connection with working with labor has resulted from the recent controversy over 'labor racketeers.'" He adds: "This has made some labor people here in Milwaukee sensitive to hiring offenders, at least in any numbers."

Also, Mr. Lopez-Rey in his article writes: "Responsible labor leaders, in turn, have expressed concern that the anti-labor cartoons and the kits of material regularly distributed to newspapers by the National Association of Manufacturers so bias public opinion that any union espousal of a plan to assist in the employment of ex-prisoners would be used against them: in such

a way as to seriously hamper their legitimate work."

Unemployment, security requirements, labor racketeering—these are but a few of the elements prevalent in our society which take their toll of the offender.

Union Action Program

These are among the negative aspects of the total problem. For the positive, I should like to call attention to the program of union action on behalf of the released prisoner as set forth in our pamphlet, "The Man Who Lived Again."

We urge the Community Services Committee of every central labor body to invite representatives of correctional groups to speak at CSC meetings in order to inform and enlighten union members.

We urge our committees to check on whether or not local correctional institutions are meeting federal standards, and we suggest they visit these institutions and work with correctional officials.

Our pamphlet also states: "Union members may be able to provide a valuable service to correctional institutions by assisting in the setting up of vocational training projects, establishing training standards, and assisting the trainees in getting jobs upon their release. . . . The interest and efforts of the community services program in cooperation with other citizen groups and public officials can do much to assure the men and women who must live again of a useful and wanted place in the community."

Another legitimate source of union help could be the prorating of union dues and initiation fees, which often are a major consideration for the offender.

Allan C. Hubanks, Executive Director of the Minneapolis Prisoners

Aid Society, states in his survey response: "One of the biggest problems that we have encountered in our limited experience is the inability of most men to pay initial fees to join various unions. Many of our clients come to us immediately after their release from prison and they seldom have enough money to make any substantial payment."

James Oberst, Placement Representative of Kentucky's Division of Probation and Parole, also centers attention on this subject. He is quoted in the November, 1959 issue of *Correctional Research* as saying: "I would like to see the business managers of more unions take a greater interest in their members who fail. There are many inmates who cannot afford to keep up their dues while confined. I would like to see many of the larger unions establish a fund to be used at the time an inmate seeks an application with any local union. They could reimburse this fund in the amount that they have used when their job is re-established and they are on their feet again."

Any number of plans would be feasible and practical in the matter of fees and dues payment. And new avenues of aid would undoubtedly open up when we utilize the experience and skills of our unions.

We cannot do it alone, however. We would have to work closely and actively with the authorized agencies in the correctional field, and they, in turn, would have to work with us.

Agency Initiative Vital

Also, it is evident from our survey that many correctional groups could exercise much more initiative than they are now doing.

Joe B. Dillinger, Executive Director of the Prisoners Aid Association of Maryland, reports on this point: "I think that labor has a very fine attitude regarding our problems but they need the initiative by the private agencies to carry this forward."

Brigadier Victor Dimond, Director of Correctional Services for Men, The Salvation Army, New York City, writes: "Our contact with labor unions could be more successful if more time were devoted to education and interpretation of the employment problems facing offenders. Such time is not now available."

Asked to characterize labor's attitude, J. Bernard Tate, Executive Director of the Connecticut Prison Association, wrote: "We believe it to be as good as we can expect. We must admit that we have not often approached a union directly."

John F. Fitzgerald, of the Massachusetts prison association, writes: "I believe that you will find that in the response to your questionnaire, most prison aid groups will indicate a lack of cohesion or sound cooperation between labor and themselves. . . . The fault lies in our hands as much as it does with labor and management."

Along with this constructive self-criticism, the majority of agencies expressed a willingness—and often an eagerness—to work in concert with labor toward a solution of the problem.

We on the labor side, stand ready to cooperate also.

A merging of strengths and talents by labor, correctional groups, business organizations, and citizen bodies could achieve profound results in this important area of human welfare.

Revolution in Prison Industries

GILBERT RODLI

President, John R. Wald Company, Huntingdon, Pa.

THIRTY-FIVE years is three and one-half decades, a minute fraction of the time that prisons, in one way or another, have made use of the labor confined within their walls to manufacture goods and products. Yet in this brief span a revolution has taken place. A forward-looking concept of penal rehabilitation has come into being. Correctional industry serves the dual role of building needed goods and products and rebuilding men and women for their return to society.

The period of thirty-five years is used because it was just this many years ago, in 1924, that the John R. Wald Company was formed and the writer entered the field of prison industries. In these few years we have seen almost a full reversal of policy in penal rehabilitation and the sale of prison-made goods. Probably at no time in the history of penology has there been such a complete abandonment of one type of operational program and the adoption of another.

Open Market Sales

When the John R. Wald Company came into being, all but five states sold prison-made goods on the open market, without regard for state boundaries. Prisoners were worked by contractors who paid the state for their labor by a flat fee or on a piece-price basis: they were in prison for punishment; it was of small concern if their labor was exploited.

Today the picture has been almost reversed. Only three states now sell

prison-made goods on the open market, and the volume of these goods has been declining steadily. Prisons are still run as places of confinement where offenders pay their debt to society. Yet, because of the vision of dedicated penologists, society now recognizes that it has a responsibility to those who have transgressed against its rules. More and more prisons are turning to carefully engineered correctional industries where prisoners perform constructive work and prepare themselves with a useful trade or skill for their return to society.

This reversal was accomplished in a comparatively short time largely because of federal legislation, particularly the 1929 Hawes-Cooper Act, which became effective in 1934. This Act made prison-manufactured goods subject to the laws of the state into which they are imported, with the result that any state could limit the sale of prison-made goods with appropriate legislation. The legislation affected the sale not only of products made within a state's own prisons, but also of any prison-made goods imported from other states.

State Use System

The Hawes-Cooper Act (strengthened by such additional federal legislation as the Ashurst-Sumner Act of 1935 and the laws of 1940) brought into focus a trend that had been under way for some years—a move toward the "state use system." By the early 1930's, many prison leaders, seeing in

the state use system the positive values long claimed by its proponents, were turning in this direction.

Virginia was one of the states where this happened. Practically all of its industries manufactured goods for the open market. Yet, even before the Hawes-Cooper Act became effective, Virginia closed down all prison factories producing goods for the general public and began remodeling its industries before establishing a group of "state use industries." Later, the Virginia Assembly enacted laws prohibiting the sale of prison-made goods on the open market and established a state use system of prisoner employment. This required all state agencies, institutions, and departments to purchase products which were available from prison shops. Shortly afterward, Tennessee and Maryland followed suit with similar programs. Both states had been active in producing prison-made goods for sale on the open market, and the complete change was most significant.

A few prison administrators resisted the restrictions imposed by federal legislation, and were reluctant to accept the responsibility for changing the prevailing system that had been in vogue for so many years. However, as pioneering states helped to establish the values claimed for the state use system, the change to this system was accelerated, and in retrospect we can see that it was made with surprisingly little confusion.

30 Programs Available

More than thirty different industrial programs are available for the state use operation. The following are at the top of the list of prison industries now operating in institutions throughout the United States.

| INDUSTRY | NUMBER OF STATE PLANTS |
|-----------------|------------------------|
| Auto Tag | 45 |
| Road Sign | 35 |
| Clothing | 35 |
| Mattress | 27 |
| Wood Furniture | 24 |
| Printing | 21 |
| Shoe | 21 |
| Metal Working | 19 |
| Knitting | 16 |
| Soap | 16 |
| Brush and Broom | 16 |
| Tobacco | 13 |
| Textbook Repair | 7 |
| Paint | 7 |

Basic Principles

The principles behind the state use program might be listed somewhat as follows:

1. Compulsory idleness shall not be one of the penalties of crime, and deliberate idleness shall not be one of its rewards.

2. Constructive employment is a positive disciplinary measure in conditioning the inmate in constructive habits necessary before and after release.

3. Inmates shall be given modern, industrial training in such a manner that the work program will be self-supporting, self-liquidating, or self-expanding.

4. The products shall be of good quality, especially designed for state, county, and municipal needs.

5. The products and industries shall be so diversified as to avoid substantially affecting any one business in the state.

6. The manufacture and sale of products of prison industries shall save money for the tax-supported institution—the consumer—and thus for the taxpayer.

Uncertainty

In spite of all that has been done in these thirty-five years, a great deal of uncertainty still surrounds the establishment of new prison industries. The problems vary from state to state. The size of the state and the number of correctional institutions involved are matters of importance. If a prison industrial program is already in existence, that fact will undoubtedly have considerable influence on decisions concerning personnel selection, responsibility, and authority.

Nonetheless, certain basic management and organization principles apply in developing and maintaining a good progressive industrial setup.

Let us assume a situation where two or more correctional institutions are involved and a complete organization of personnel is to be developed.

The first step is the establishment of a central office, with a deputy commissioner or assistant director in charge, responsible for overall general administration. The most important functions of this central office are to decide what to produce and in which institutions the industries should be located, and to organize and maintain a highly effective sales force.

Must Sell Product

In view of a state use law that requires state agencies to purchase from prison industries, a question that naturally arises is, "Are sales efforts necessary?" The answer is given by actual practice, which has shown that prison industries must promote their products and services if they wish to establish and maintain a really thriving and progressive manufacturing business.

The salesman or industrial representative has two functions: to pro-

mote the various products manufactured, with resultant expansion of this market, and to promote and maintain good customer relationships.

In prison industries, just as in even the best factories of private industry, customers sometimes complain about the service or the goods. In these instances, the prison industries' representatives are in a position to make adjustments and to report to the factory superintendents on the actual conditions in the field. This results in maintenance of quality levels in the shops and helps to develop higher standards of production levels.

Confining the responsibilities and duties of the central office to the establishment of industries and maintenance of a sales force eliminates the need for a large payroll and staff. We have noted a tendency at times to build up a large staff of specialists in the central office to perform duties that could best be carried out at the institutional level; the result is that the office has "too many chiefs and not enough braves."

The prison industries unit at the institutional level should be under the general supervision of the central office but should be specifically responsible for production controls, including quality of goods, quantity, cost accounting, and other records essential for efficient operation of any industry.

Placing Responsibility

When two or more industries are operating in one institution, it is generally desirable to place the responsibility for local management with a production manager or assistant to the central office director. His staff should include someone in charge of cost accounting and sales records.

Each industry should also have a specialist designated as superintendent, with the necessary foremen and instructors.

The relationship between the local industries' production manager and the warden or superintendent should be well defined and carefully established. Although the responsibility for production methods and procedures and general plant management can very well be placed with the industries group, the actual assignment of men, the decision as to working hours, and the full control of prisoners should rest with the warden or superintendent.

Once a complete state use prison industries system is established through legislation, the next important step is the appointment of competent management. Adequate financing and proper legislation can be productive only when personnel are resourceful, courageous, and enthusiastic.

Capable Administrators

It is presumed that sufficient funds will be made available and that the salary scale will be commensurate with the responsibility required of the director and his staff. The importance of having capable people in every position cannot be overemphasized. The director or central office manager must be of the highest character and should have the responsibility, opportunity, and ability to choose efficient subordinates who will carry out an aggressive, well-planned, well-executed program.

The responsibilities of a director of prison industries are comparable to those of a chief executive of a large manufacturing company, although in some respects they can be even more complex. The reason is that a prison

industrial system is not limited to one manufacturing plant; it may include as many as fifteen or twenty different plants producing a wide variety of items. Managerial ability therefore, must be of the highest order.

So far we have outlined the process of putting industries into operation. Fundamental to the actual establishment and successful operation of a sound prison industries plan is proper legislation, in the form of a state use law.

Pattern for Law

The state use law, also termed the "prison labor law," follows a rather definite and specific pattern in most states. Here are some of its most common provisions:

1. The authority to establish industries in correctional institutions of the state is delegated to the administrative board or commissioner operating the prison system.

That is where the responsibility belongs. The commissioner or the board is best qualified to evaluate the type of employment that will best serve the department's needs and, more important, that will be most beneficial for prisoners. The primary purpose of prison industries is to give them constructive employment and develop new skills or better work habits. Financial returns, while important, are secondary. The prison administrator should not be required to consider the possible effects of new industries on outside manufacturers if the values accruing to his department are sufficient to justify the operation. His first responsibility is to the department and the state's taxpayers.

This philosophy is contrary to the thinking of those penologists who favor advisory commissions for prison

industries. Experience and results furnish little if any reason for establishing such commissions. When the chips are down, each member of an advisory commission finds himself obligated to maintain loyalty to the trade or business association he represents. He naturally takes the position that he is serving on the commission to protect the interests of that group. The two objectives are not compatible; at any rate, they may often be conflicting.

2. The authority to establish industries includes the power to purchase raw materials and equipment, in the manner provided by law, and to engage necessary supervisory personnel.

Practically all state use legislation specifies that all departments, institutions, and agencies of the state which are supported in whole or in part by the state shall purchase articles and products produced by prison industries. A few states go further and include political subdivisions as well; however, the more common practice is to provide that political subdivisions *may* (not *must*) purchase. This necessitates special sales efforts by the prison industries system to take advantage of the potential market.

3. Quite often the law provides that exceptions from the mandatory purchase provision may be made when, in the opinion of a specified committee (consisting of, say, the director of correction, the director of purchases, and the state auditor), the articles produced do not meet the reasonable requirements of certain departments.

4. The law specifies that the prison department shall fix and determine prices at which all articles or products manufactured shall be sold, but that such prices shall be uniform, nondis-

criminating, and not higher than the wholesale market prices.

5. Whenever funds are not available to the department for establishing a prison industries program, it is important that new legislation provide the necessary appropriation and authorize the prison management to use it for buildings, equipment, supplies, materials, salaries, and other necessary expenses incident to the employment of prisoners.

Recently several states have included a provision in their state use laws which empowers the correctional administration to enter into contracts and agreements on a self-liquidating basis with respect to the acquisition or purchase of equipment. These contracts provide that the equipment may be paid for over a period of not more than ten years and specify the maximum amount of such purchases at any one time. The amounts are payable solely from revenues derived from the prison industries department.

The reasons for a revolving fund are common, but in several situations the limitation on the amount permitted to accumulate has been so drastic that expansion of industries—or sometimes even the operation of existing ones—is seriously curtailed.

A reasonable approach to this problem is to specify that all money collected from the sale of products manufactured in prison industries shall be deposited into a special fund and shall be used solely for the purchase of manufacturing supplies, equipment, machinery, and buildings used to carry out the purposes of the prison labor law. Accumulation of unnecessarily large unexpended funds can be prevented by transfer of the excess to the state general

revenue fund when, in the opinion of the governor, the prison industries account is bigger than it need be. Or a committee consisting of the governor, the state auditor, and the state treasurer may be designated to make this decision.

6. In almost every state the prison labor law now makes it unlawful to sell or offer for sale in the open market any articles or products manufactured by prisoners of that state or any other state.

7. Finally, a prison labor law generally includes penalties for violations of its provisions.

Maryland's Program

The present outstanding success of Maryland's state use industries system demonstrates the benefits to be derived in contrast to the waste in earlier types of operation. The program of prisoner employment there is especially interesting because it shows how necessity is the mother of invention (which, in this instance, proved to be diversification).

Maryland has full productive employment of prisoners—even though, compared to several other more populous states, it has a greater proportion of prisoners. At the same time, because of its small general population, it has a small state ward population, a condition which limits the potential market for many state use products, particularly clothing, food, and maintenance supplies. The result: Maryland was practically forced to diversify its state use program and prisoner employment opportunities.

No single activity would have had a market sufficient to warrant an economical operation. Hence, a variety of small projects (in itself a virtue in this day of special efforts toward classification and assignment according to individual needs, aptitudes, and productivity). Maryland now has nineteen different industrial plants operating in its state correctional institutions. (Only four other states have more than fifteen; nine states have eleven to fourteen different industries; seventeen states operate from six to ten.)

Proven in Practice

Like any other business, the state use system of prison industries—the best method for productive prisoner employment—requires careful attention to good business practices.

It also requires administrative officials to be constantly alert to destructive legislation, proposals designed to prevent installation of new plants and hinder expansion of existing plants or even eradicate them entirely.

Labor and industry originally supported the state use system as an alternative to open market sales. How realistic is it now for some of their local representatives to oppose the very system they once espoused so strongly?

The state use law has been proven in practice. It is the best economic approach to penal rehabilitation. It poses no insuperable problems to enlightened state governments or to labor and industry.

Vocational Guidance in a Correctional Program

MORLINE M. ANDERSON

Chief, Special Services, Division of Corrections, Wisconsin Department of Public Welfare

IN OUR society a man's work probably takes up the greatest part of his waking life. His mental and physical well-being usually depend on it. By it he supports himself and his family; through it he can have an outlet for tensions and anxieties; it can bring him into close and friendly relations with others; if he needs recognition and prestige it can provide them; and, if it is a creative activity, it can satisfy his basic emotional needs. Young people frequently look upon employment as a symbol of maturity; many older people try to postpone their retirement because their work both satisfies them and proves them useful to society.

Unfortunately, many people in our society never choose the right work or adjust themselves to it, or find it very difficult to do so. Most young people are uncertain about their futures; some have no idea how to choose a vocation or how to prepare for it, and never find a satisfying placement. A man needs to feel valuable, a unique and productive member of society.

Those who have come in conflict with the law and are in correctional institutions or on probation or parole have just as much need for satisfying work. Their adjustment in a vocation—which takes up such a large part of their time—necessarily has a profound effect on their lives. A correctional program should make this area of man's activities a major concern.

The number of states which require that employment be available before release on parole or that steady employment be maintained during supervision indicates that the importance of vocational training and adjustment has been almost universally accepted.

Except for purposes of discussion, an institution's vocational guidance and training program cannot be separated from or considered independently of its other treatment programs. The goals and philosophy of an institution determine what emphasis it places on this program, and what type of program it is. For instance, Wisconsin's Division of Corrections has this philosophy:

1. Our basic responsibility—established by law and public policy—is the protection of society. Society will receive maximum protection only from a program which treats each offender as a person who, with his social, mental, physical, or spiritual problems, is socially ill.

2. The function of an institution or a correctional service is not to punish but to train, retrain, educate, guide, and counsel, and through psychological, psychiatric, and social services to treat the causes of the antisocial or criminal conduct.

3. Treatment and rehabilitative services should do as much as possible to restore people to useful living, to restore or develop self-respect, self-confidence, and respect for the rights

of others, and to develop a social conscience.

4. People have the capacity to improve: every man has God-given worth and dignity. We can motivate them to change, and, with adequate programs and professional services, can improve their chances of becoming constructive members of society when they are released.

5. Even convicted and confined men have certain rights. They may lose their civil rights for a time, but they do retain certain rights which any good prison or correctional system must recognize. The rights of a person under restraint in a free and democratic society were perhaps best expressed by Myrl Alexander, President of the American Correctional Association in 1956, as follows:

The right to clean, decent surroundings with competent attention to his physical and mental well-being.

The right to maintain and reinforce the strengthening ties which bind him to his family and to his community.

The right to develop and maintain skills as a productive worker in our economic system.

The right to fair, impartial, intelligent treatment without special privilege or license for any man.

The right to positive guidance and counsel from correctional personnel possessed of understanding and skill.¹

To these we would add the right to individualized treatment and protection by personnel selected for their merit and not because of their religious or political affiliation, personnel who are assured of tenure during good behavior and adequately and continuously trained to improve their skills.

¹ Myrl Alexander, Presidential Address, Proceedings of the 86th Annual Congress of Correction, 1956.

Need for Flexibility

Within the framework of the philosophy of the organization, the vocational guidance and training program must be geared to meet a wide variety of needs. Correctional institutions or agencies, in Wisconsin as in most states, have little control over intake. If the commitment or sentence is legally proper and within the jurisdiction of the sentencing court, the offender must be admitted. Even when a central agency controls intake, reassigning the offender to a special institution where possible, his vocational training need has only a slight influence on the choice of institution: there are not many of them, their programs are limited, and the chief criteria for assignment are usually age, security needs, degree of criminality, and special treatment required. This lack of control over intake and inability to be highly selective has definite implications for the vocational guidance and training program (as for the other treatment programs): the program of each institution must be complete and flexible enough to meet the variety of problems and needs of its heterogeneous population. Though to some extent they vary with particular intake limitations, usually the offenders who need vocational guidance and training are of these types:

1. The almost completely inexperienced person who, usually because of his youth or lack of prior guidance and counseling, has no vocational choice at all or has made one that is questionable.

2. The person who has had fairly extensive experience but wants to or must change occupations.

3. The person who wants to be trained, and wants help in deciding

the extent and type of training he should have.

4. The person who needs other services, such as medical treatment, to make him more employable.

5. The person who is so emotionally or socially maladjusted that he cannot do any job.

Services needed may range from providing information about vocational opportunities and requirements in relation to ability and potential, through counseling or therapy by a skilled practitioner. In such a program, vocational guidance and training is not the private property of any single discipline but instead requires the concerted efforts and different skills of all staff members.

Focus on the Individual

Individual treatment is as necessary in vocational guidance as in any of the other processes connected with the rehabilitation of the offender. Before he can make a proper choice of vocation or a satisfactory adjustment to his job, a person must learn as much as he can about himself. Constructive vocational guidance and counseling must take into account the subject's interests, desires, motivation, aptitudes, mental and physical capacities, personal traits, education, experience, social and economic influences, and leisure-time activities and interests. According to the training resources that are available and the situation and community to which the prisoner will return, this knowledge of his character can be translated into a specific program.

Preventive and Remedial

If it is to be of maximum value, a vocational guidance and training program for offenders should be both preventive and remedial. Most other

programs in the community are primarily preventive, for their aim is to help people to make satisfactory choices of vocations, and thus to prevent maladjustment and its attendant social and personal problems. This approach is important in correctional programs; but it is equally important to help the offender to redirect and revise his choice of work if it is unsatisfying to him, unrealistic in view of his abilities and capacities, or unattainable in the community to which he will return.

A Reformatory Program

The Wisconsin State Reformatory at Green Bay has a vocational guidance and training program which we think is sound and embodies the philosophy and goals of the Division of Corrections. The institution is one of the six which the Division operates.

The Division of Corrections is an integrated system responsible for all the state's correctional institutions, a statewide probation and parole service, a psychiatric service which provides psychiatric and psychological services to all institutions, and standards of jail care and construction. The organization provides treatment services that begin with the conviction of the offender (a presentence investigation is made if the court requests it), follows through the institution program or probation, and does not end until discharge from conditional release or parole.

The Wisconsin State Reformatory is established by statute for male first felony offenders between the ages of sixteen and thirty. Most inmates are directly committed to it by courts, but the Department of Public Welfare (of which the Division of Corrections is one of five operating divisions) has authority to transfer persons commit-

ted to it from one correctional institution to another according to offenders' needs for special treatment or training, and the programs available. At present the average daily population of the Reformatory is about 975. The average age of the inmates is twenty-one. Although parole may legally be granted at any time, eligibility has been administratively established at nine months or half the maximum sentence, whichever is less. The average length of stay is thirteen months.

The Reformatory staff regard guidance and training as an integral part of the whole correctional treatment program and have a realistic goal: training a man to his maximum potential and preparing him for employment in the community. They carry on this program concurrent with other treatment programs available at the institution and focus all these forces on the individual inmate and his needs. Their aim is to return him to the community as soon as possible, to lead a useful, law-abiding life.

The offender's arrival at the institution sets into motion the entire correctional team. If the probation and parole agent of the field services has already done a presentence investigation—which is very frequently the case—his report, which is in effect a comprehensive social history, is transmitted to the institution. In return, the institution always sends him the intake information provided by its record unit and, if there is no presentence report, an admission social history is made. This history, which is prepared by a competent caseworker (the minimum standard for beginning workers is two years of graduate training in an accredited school of social work), routinely includes data on

vocational development and adjustment. The field agent follows the offender's progress, visiting him periodically to plan with him and the institution staff for his return to field supervision.

After the usual quarantine period a member of the vocational education staff takes the inmate on a tour of the institution and explains to him the facilities for academic and vocational education, the various jobs in the maintenance shops, and the other treatment and training resources available to him. This orientation is followed by a series of evaluations and counseling sessions with key personnel in the institution.

1. In the course of his general investigations the clinical psychologist gathers test results and other data specifically related to the offender's vocational training. Testing and interviewing produces information on his personality, interests, desires, motivation, aptitude, and physical and intellectual capacities.

2. The academic school principal administers grade level achievement tests, evaluates the potential for further academic training, and tells the offender about the academic study program available to him.

3. The director of vocational training explores with the inmate his interest, his training and experience, and his potentials, in relation to the training resources available, and helps him to select a program which will be satisfying to him and pertinent to his future in the community.

The supervisor of custody, the recreation department, the chaplain, and the medical and dental units also see the offender. Their findings and recommendations are channeled to the social worker, who combines this in-

formation with the data supplied by the admission investigation and his own interviews and observations to make a case history. This provides the classification committee with a detailed and comprehensive picture of the individual, his development, and his present state of adjustment.

The validity and usefulness of the information that is gathered, organized, and interpreted depends on the competence of the staff members involved. The very process of gathering this information in interviews with the offender is an integral part of the guidance program.

Major Training Resources

The major training resources at the Reformatory are as follows:

1. An academic school program.

This provides complete elementary education with an eighth grade certificate issued by the local superintendent of schools, and a high school curriculum with standards that provide for transfer of credits to other schools throughout the state. Inmates who complete all requirements receive a diploma from the last high school they attended. The Reformatory observes the state compulsory attendance standards and the State Board of Education's standards for qualifications for teachers. Correspondence courses from the University of Wisconsin Extension Division are available for those who wish to study in areas not included in the high school curriculum or in areas beyond the high school level; remedial classes are held for those unable to benefit from or cope with the regular curriculum.

2. A vocational education curriculum comparable to that of a good vocational school in the community.

Courses are given in woodworking, carpentry, drafting (mechanical and

architectural), blueprint reading, auto mechanics, sheetmetal work, machine shop work, welding, printing, arts and crafts, painting and decorating, practical math, masonry, foundry work, and physical education. This curriculum is planned to meet the interests and needs of the Reformatory population and the subjects it covers are those which can most easily be transferred to the situation the inmate will face in the community. The instructors are certified by the State Board of Vocational and Adult Education and (like the teachers of the academic program) are selected not only for their competence in the technical aspects of their profession but also for their warmth, feeling for people, and ability to accept and work with offenders as worth-while human beings.

3. A system of on-the-job training which makes use of the many opportunities for vocational and trades training in the maintenance and industries programs.

This tremendous opportunity can be used best if the necessary knowledge and skills are systematically transmitted to the man on such a training assignment. Since there is, or can be, vocational training value in almost any assignment, the Reformatory is careful to employ tradespeople, foremen, or guards who, if they do not have teaching ability, can be trained to teach what they know. Work and instruction are available in almost every trade or vocation.

Classification

About thirty days after his arrival at the institution and when the study and evaluation process is complete, the inmate meets the classification committee. They select a treatment and training program which, based

on a
his p
real
thing
learn
consi
dislik
which
in the
cal, a
acad
traini
rience
Th
Refor
work
psych
unit,
train
memb
offen
far as
his o
progr
his p
and
able
De
and
predi
a m
chang
must
of th
conti
Qu
not
must
consi
bilit
wher
avail
insti
ers. T
reco
progr
dustr

on a complete picture of the offender, his problems and his needs, will have real meaning for him in terms of the things he is equipped to do, can learn to do, and can like doing. They consider his aptitudes, his likes and dislikes, the type of employment which is apt to be available to him in the community, his physical, medical, and spiritual needs, his need for academic instruction or vocational training, and the type of work experience which could be helpful to him.

The classification committee at the Reformatory consists of the social worker and representatives from the psychology department, the custody unit, and the academic and vocational training units. Usually these staff members are the people who saw the offender for evaluation and study. As far as possible they allow him to make his own choice. But he must select a program that is realistic in view of his potentials, capacities, and needs, and a goal that is reasonably attainable for him.

Despite our most diligent efforts and best intentions we cannot always predict the course of human behavior: a man's needs and interests can change. The inmate's adjustment must be followed up and the adequacy of the institution treatment program continually reappraised.

Quite obviously this follow-up cannot be everyone's responsibility, but must be specifically assigned. In Wisconsin institutions it is the responsibility of the social service department where sufficient social service staff is available to permit the assignment of institution caseloads to social workers. The social worker maintains case records dealing with the inmate's progress, using reports from the industries foreman, the academic and

vocational instructors, the disciplinary court, and the custodial staff. He briefs this information and makes it available to the classification committee at the regular reclassification sessions. The social worker is responsible for correlating all the information about the inmates on his caseload and he is the person best able to give custodial staff or others information which would help them to deal more effectively with any particular case.

After he has been classified and assigned in the vocational training program, the student has sixty hours of training in as many jobs as he desires to explore before he selects one. In this way he can further test and evaluate his interests while the training staff test and evaluate him. A high degree of flexibility is possible: a particular student's program may involve full-time academic school, vocational school, on-the-job training, or a work assignment—or a combination of these.

To ensure that the offender can transfer the knowledge, skill, and experience he gains to his employment in the community, all the job assignments in the maintenance shops and industries are broken down into the processes established by the State Industrial Commission for apprenticeships. If a student has the interest and aptitude he can complete a program equivalent to a like apprenticeship program in the community; a student released before completing it can, with the acceptance of the local apprenticeship committee, transfer into a community program. The Reformatory makes every effort to provide a standard of training comparable to that in the community.

It recognizes, however, that even more important than a high degree of specialized skill are good work

habits and a positive attitude toward future employment. The student proceeds through the various processes at his own speed, which is determined by his ability and motivation. With the help of an understanding and skilled instructor he progresses from the simple to the more difficult operations and acquires a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction. It is not intended that every offender attain journeyman competence. But it is intended that each receive as much appropriate training as he wants and can use, understand his interests and capabilities better, and be better equipped to find and hold a job when he is released.

Parole and Release

After nine months or half the maximum sentence the inmate is eligible to apply for parole. At this time the parole board reviews the case. It studies the record of the offender's progress and the report from the field on developments in his home and

community, and interviews him. It grants parole if it thinks the offender is ready to make a successful transfer to the community.

Before he is released the parolee participates in regular "parole classes." These sessions, directed by a trained social worker, provide information about parole supervision, the rules of parole, employment opportunities and resources, job hunting techniques, and any of the other matters which concern the group. The group system has the practical advantage of enabling a small staff to provide service to a number of cases; also, by this method it is frequently possible to reach those who cannot be reached otherwise.

These parole orientation sessions are the final phase of the institution's vocational guidance and training program. Its effectiveness will to a great extent determine how well the offender adjusts on parole, and ultimately how successful our correctional program is.

be

N

be em
a mar
consid
justm
have a
to be
ducte
wheth
New Y
parole
to hav
they c
unabl
decide
deal v
as a
releas

We
minist
pact f
forty-e
Hawa
Unite
main

"I.
quire
emplo
from

¹The
and AL

Should an Inmate Have a Job before Being Released on Parole?

L. STANLEY CLEVINGER

Administrative Director, New York State Division of Parole

JOHN M. STANTON

Director of Research, New York State Division of Parole

NO ONE questions the general policy of requiring parolees to be employed; no one doubts that how a man makes out on parole depends considerably on his occupational adjustment. But is it necessary that he have a bona fide offer of a job in order to be paroled? No state has ever conducted formal research to determine whether this condition is essential. In New York, where inmates eligible for parole have generally been required to have jobs waiting for them before they can be released, many have been unable to satisfy the requirement. We decided to find out how other states deal with the matter of employment as a condition underlying parole release.

Procedure

We sent questionnaires to the administrators of the Interstate Compact for Parolees and Probationers in forty-eight states, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii,¹ and to the chairman of the United States Board of Parole. The main items were as follows:

"1. In your state is an inmate required to have a bona fide offer of employment before he is released from the institution on parole?

Yes.....No.....

¹ The questionnaire was sent before Hawaii and Alaska were admitted to the Union.

"2. If the answer is yes, please check the following:

Required by statute

Required by board rules

"3. If the answer is no, please check the following:

At discretion of board

No requirement

"4. If the answer is yes, please quote pertinent lines in statute or board rules."

Two other items followed—one, in four parts, requiring answers from states not having a specific requirement relating to employment; and the other asking for additional comments.

Results

Completed questionnaires were returned by forty-five states, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the United States Board of Parole. Tabulation of the answers to the first three items appears on page 160.

The table shows that an inmate is required to have employment before release on parole in *fourteen* of the forty-eight responding jurisdictions in accordance with *statute*, and in *sixteen* in accordance with parole board rule; in *eighteen* the requirement is not made by either statute or rule but may be made at the board's *discretion*.

Appendix A below quotes the pertinent lines in the statutes of the fourteen jurisdictions where the employment condition is required by law. Appendix B contains the rules as given by the sixteen jurisdictions where the employment requirement is fixed by board rule. Appendix C presents the comments from eighteen jurisdictions where employment before release is not required by either statute or board rule but may be required at the board's discretion.

No jurisdiction indicated on the questionnaire that there is "no requirement" with respect to employment before release.

Twelve of the fourteen jurisdictions requiring employment as a condition of release (Appendix A) provide, in the same statute, for release under other circumstances when employment is not available; for example, when maintenance is assured. Only New York and South Carolina have no statutory provision for release other

IS INMATE REQUIRED TO HAVE A BONA FIDE OFFER OF EMPLOYMENT BEFORE RELEASE ON PAROLE?

| <i>Jurisdiction</i> | <i>Yes: by Statute</i> | <i>Yes: by Board Rules</i> | <i>No: by Discretion of Board</i> | <i>Jurisdiction</i> | <i>Yes: by Statute</i> | <i>Yes: by Board Rules</i> | <i>No: by Discretion of Board</i> |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| Alabama | x* | | | Nevada | | x | |
| Arizona | | | x | New Jersey | | | x |
| Arkansas | | | x | New Mexico | x* | | |
| California | | | x | New York | x** | | |
| Colorado | | | x | No. Carolina | | x | |
| Connecticut | | x* | | No. Dakota | | | x |
| Delaware | | x | | Ohio | | | x |
| Florida | x* | | | Oregon | | | x |
| Georgia | x* | | | Pennsylvania | | x* | |
| Hawaii | | | x | Puerto Rico | x* | | |
| Idaho | | | x | Rhode Island | | x | |
| Illinois | | | x | So. Carolina | x | | |
| Indiana | x* | | | So. Dakota | x* | | |
| Iowa | x* | | | Tennessee | | x | |
| Kansas | | x* | | Texas | x* | | |
| Kentucky | x* | | | U.S. Board of Parole | | | x |
| Louisiana | | x* | | Utah | | | x |
| Maine | | | x | Vermont | | | x |
| Maryland | | | x | Virginia | | x* | |
| Massachusetts | | x* | | Washington | | | x |
| Michigan | x* | | | W. Virginia | | x | |
| Minnesota | | x* | | Wisconsin | x* | | |
| Mississippi | | x | | Wyoming | | | x |
| Missouri | | x* | | | | | |
| Montana | | x* | | | | | |
| | | | | TOTAL | 14 | 16 | 18 |

* Provides for exceptions.

** Recent interpretation of statute is that parole board has authority to release inmate

if it has reasonable assurance he will obtain employment after release.

on the
"no re-
employ-
ditions
condition
vide, in
e under
employ-
example,
d. Only
na have
ase other

BEFORE

No:
by
Discretion
of Board

x

than by employment. This does not necessarily mean that parole release policy there is less flexible than in the twelve other jurisdictions. In South Carolina, "Seldom is a worthy case held up for lack of employment and no case has ever been denied solely for lack of employment." In New York the parole board releases to other jurisdictions parolees without employment but assured of maintenance when the other jurisdiction signifies willingness to accept them under these circumstances. It releases on parole in New York State inmates physically incapable of working but assured of maintenance. It has adopted the policy, based on recent interpretation of the statute, of releasing selected inmates when it has reasonable assurance that they will obtain employment after release.

Of the sixteen jurisdictions where employment is required by board rule (Appendix B), nine allow exceptions; possibly some of the other seven do also. (The replies to the questionnaire could not contain all the rules and practices of parole operations.)

The eighteen jurisdictions where the parole board's discretion determines whether employment before release is required (Appendix C) were asked to answer an additional four-part item on their experience relating to:

1. Average length of time required by parolees to obtain suitable employment following their arrival in the community.

2. Incidence of parole violation in relation to unemployment immediately following release.

3. Special cooperative procedure involving state employment service, private employment agencies, public and private welfare agencies, religious

agencies, etc., and what results are obtained.

4. Specific arrangements with public welfare departments for obtaining financial assistance for persons released without jobs and unable to obtain jobs within a reasonable length of time.

The answers to parts 1 and 2 were not tabulated: in some instances answers were not given; in others they were the kind that did not lend themselves to tabulation. For example, the following are some of the replies to part 1: "We pretty well require proposed employment before release." "Reasonable." "In view of the small number that are released on this basis, the time element is negligible." "Most parolees have employment upon arrival." In a few other answers the range of the average period reported was from "within ten days" to "ninety days."

Some jurisdictions did not reply to part 2 because "no statistical data" were available. Most of those that did answer expressed opinions, varying from "no relation" (of parole violation to unemployment immediately following release) to "high relation."

The replies to parts 3 and 4 (state identifications not given) are not amenable to tabulation but they contain information of interest; they will be found in Appendices D and E, respectively.

Appendix D shows that state employment agency services are found helpful by eleven jurisdictions. Other agencies and methods are used by the remaining jurisdictions.

Appendix E shows that only one jurisdiction makes specific arrangements, as a matter of policy, with public welfare departments for obtaining financial assistance for persons

e will obtain

released without jobs. In eight other jurisdictions specific arrangements are not made but public welfare agencies are considered relatively cooperative and in some cases will give financial assistance if necessary to the parolee and his dependents after he is released.

Appendices C, D, and E reveal that the practice of releasing carefully selected inmates without guaranteed employment causes no great problems. It should be noted, however, that in practice most of the eighteen jurisdictions involved generally adhere to the policy of not releasing unless employment or maintenance is assured.

Discussion of Results

Pertinent lines in statutes and board rules are given here, in Appendices A and B, so that the reader can interpret them for himself, but he is cautioned to look further into actual practice before arriving at conclusions. For example, the New York statute reads: "No prisoner shall be released on parole except by the unanimous vote of the members of the Board of Parole hearing the case, nor unless such members are satisfied that he will be suitably employed in self-sustaining employment if so released." But it would certainly be unwise for anyone not familiar with parole in New York to interpret what this statute means in practice. In the past it was generally interpreted to mean that no able-bodied inmate could be released on parole unless he were guaranteed specific employment. Recently, however, it has been interpreted, not generally but in some instances, to mean that if the Board of Parole has reasonable assurance that an inmate would obtain employment after release, he might be paroled.

A review of the results of this study indicates that board policy is more important operationally than are the stated statutes or rules. In most jurisdictions board policy, regardless of how the statute or rule reads, requires a guaranteed job before release with certain exceptions. The exceptions are inmates who are unable to work or who will be self-supporting after release. No jurisdiction has a rigid policy of no exceptions to the rule of guaranteed employment before release; some jurisdictions follow a policy of allowing inmates to be released without specific jobs.

Appendix A

STATUTES IN FOURTEEN JURISDICTIONS REQUIRING BONA FIDE OFFER OF EMPLOYMENT BEFORE RELEASE ON PAROLE

Alabama—"No prisoner shall be released on parole . . . unless the Board is satisfied that he will be suitably employed in self-sustaining employment or that he will not become a public charge if so released."—Title 42, Section 8, Code of Alabama 1940, as amended.

Florida—"No person shall be placed on parole unless and until the Commission is satisfied that he will be suitably employed in self-sustaining employment, or that he will not become a public charge."—Chapter 947.18.

Georgia—"No person shall be released on pardon or placed on parole unless and until the Board is satisfied that he will be suitably employed in self-sustaining employment, or that he will not become a public charge."—Georgia Laws, 1943, Pardons and Paroles Board Created.

Indiana—"No particular period of assured employment shall be required

in releasing prisoners on parole but each Board of Parole may adopt rules and regulations with respect thereto. . . . No prisoner shall be released on parole . . . unless such Board is satisfied that he will be suitably employed in self-sustaining employment if so released, or when arrangements for his maintenance and care have otherwise been made."—Section 29, Acts 1953.

Iowa—"No person shall be released on parole until the board of parole shall have satisfactory evidence that arrangements have been made for his employment or maintenance. Said board may render assistance to prisoners about to be paroled in procuring employment and the necessary expenses incident thereto shall be paid as other expenses of the board are paid."—247.8.

Kentucky—"A prisoner shall be placed on parole only when arrangements have been made for his proper employment or for his maintenance and care." KRS 439.340, Paragraph (2).

Michigan—"No prisoner shall be released on parole until the parole board shall have satisfactory evidence that arrangements have been made for such honorable and useful employment as he is capable of performing, or for his education, or for his care if he is mentally or physically ill or incapacitated." Sec. 33 (c) Mich. Corrections Act.

New Mexico—"The board may release on parole any person confined in any correctional institution administered by state authorities, except persons under sentence of death, when the prisoner gives evidence of having secured gainful employment or satisfactory evidence of self-support."—Parole Act of 1955, Sec. 13.

New York—"No prisoner shall be released on parole except by the unanimous vote of the members of the board of parole hearing the case, nor unless such members are satisfied that he will be suitably employed in self-sustaining employment if so released."—N.Y. Correction Law, Section 214.

Puerto Rico—"No prisoner may be released on parole unless the board has previously made proper arrangements for his employment, or his support and care."—Section 6.

South Carolina—"No . . . prisoner shall be paroled until it shall appear . . . that suitable employment has been secured for him."—Section 55-612, 1952 Code of Laws for S.C.

South Dakota—"The Department shall keep on file a directory of individuals, associations, and corporations who are willing to employ parolees and probationers so as to be better enabled to secure employment for such person put in its charge on probation or under parole. No person shall be admitted to parole until and unless employment has been secured for him by the department or the beneficial occupation of his time has been otherwise assured. The Department shall be assured that the employment will have some permanence and that it will be reasonable to believe that the parolee will be able to continue in the same employment until the end of his parole."—13.5304 SDC as amended by Chapter 31 Session Laws of 1955.

Texas—"A prisoner shall be placed on parole only when arrangements have been made for his proper employment or for his maintenance and care."

Wisconsin—"No . . . prisoner shall be paroled until the department is

satisfied that suitable employment has been secured for him, unless otherwise provided for by the department."—Wisconsin Statutes 57.06 (2).

Appendix B

BOARD RULES IN FOURTEEN² OF SIXTEEN JURISDICTIONS REQUIRING BONA FIDE OFFER OF EMPLOYMENT BEFORE RELEASE ON PAROLE

Connecticut—"If the Board grants parole the prisoner shall not be released on parole unless he has a suitable parole plan with regard to employment and residence. However, the requirement regarding employment may be waived if the prisoner is unable to work due to physical or mental disability and when it is known that adequate maintenance will be provided for him by relatives, friends, or other agencies."—Rules and Regulations, Board of Parole, Section 5D.

Delaware—"We do not have any rules and regulations that are in writing governing the release of prisoners. It is an unwritten law that any and all subjects that come before the board and are given release on parole must have a satisfactory job and home to go to."

Kansas—Requirement that inmate have a bona fide offer of employment "applies specifically to adult inmates. Reformatory inmates are sometimes paroled to parental home when assistance is indicated toward obtaining employment."

Louisiana—"Before a prisoner is released on parole, it is required that bona fide employment be available to him at the time of his release. The employment may be at any honest trade or occupation that will provide a wage or income sufficient for the

parolee's ordinary expenses of living. This requirement is satisfied if the parolee is engaged in the operation of his own store, business or farm. No employment opportunity is considered unless the pay is equivalent to the prevailing wage for the service the parolee will render. The requirement with reference to sustaining employment may be waived if the prisoner is unable to work due to physical or mental disability and when it is known that adequate maintenance will be provided for him by relatives, friends or other agencies."—State Board of Parole's rules, part 7.

Massachusetts — "In certain cases where reasonable assurance is given by reliable persons or agencies that a prospective parolee will be employed by another—such as a reliable employment agency, union business agent, etc.—the board will waive the usual requirement."

Minnesota—"If an individual is granted parole, the release of said individual shall be effected after a suitable parole plan has been developed and approved."

Mississippi—"A parolee must have a sponsor, an employer, who signs an Employer's Agreement and stipulates therein where subject will live, what he will pay subject, what he will furnish in way of a house to live in, conveniences, etc."

Missouri—"When in its opinion there is reasonable probability that the prisoner can be released without detriment to the community or to himself, the board shall release on parole any person confined in any correctional institution administered by state authorities."—Sec. 549, para. 1.

Montana—"Every inmate is required to have a suitable home and gainful

²Two states did not supply information.

employment guaranteed for him by some responsible and reputable person, firm or corporation as part of his parole plan. However, the Board may in its discretion grant parole if the prospect for gainful employment of the paroled inmate appears immediately good."—Montana Board of Pardons, February, 1956: Procedure, Rules and Regulations Governing the Granting of Release on Parole, Applications for Executive Clemency, Pardon, Remissions of Fines and Forfeitures, Commutations of Sentence, and Restoration of Civil Rights.

Nevada—"A parolee must be held in our prison until suitable employment is obtained by the Department of Parole and Probation."

North Carolina—"There is no written rule requiring employment prior to release nor is there any statute covering employment. However, among the factors considered in parole selection the following is stated: 'The work and residence plan proposed for the prisoner on his release.' It is a standing order to all investigators that each man before being finally considered by the Board must have a suitable plan of employment."

Pennsylvania—"There is nothing in the law making availability of employment a necessary condition of eligibility for parole. The board requires employment by rule but allows many exceptions depending on social conditions, ability of the family to support the parolee temporarily, accumulated savings of parole candidate, his physical fitness, etc."

Virginia—"Every prisoner who is able to work is required to have suitable employment guaranteed for him by some responsible and reputable person as a part of his parole plan

before he can be released from prison; provided, however, that if employment for the inmate granted favorable consideration for parole is not immediately available the board may, in its discretion, grant parole if the prospect for employment of the parolee seems immediately good."

West Virginia—"Every inmate is required to have a suitable home and gainful employment guaranteed for him by some responsible and reputable person, firm or corporation as part of his parole plan."

Appendix C

COMMENTS BY SIXTEEN³ OF EIGHTEEN JURISDICTIONS NOT REQUIRING, BY STATUTE OR BOARD RULE, BONA FIDE OFFER OF EMPLOYMENT BEFORE RELEASE ON PAROLE

Arizona—"Due to high number of migratory field workers and Mexican nationals who come under our supervision, we release parolees without stated employment if inmate can furnish a residence offer."

Arkansas—"We would not favor statute, but rather we favor board rule. Actually, it must be remembered we are not dealing with mechanical things, but human beings, and certainly we feel there should be some latitude in formulating a parole plan."

California—"California requires that all individuals being released on parole have a suitable employment or residence program to which to go upon their arrival in the community. Approximately 85 per cent of all cases released on parole go to a definite and designated employment program. One of the conditions of parole is that it is necessary that a parolee maintains

³Two states did not supply information.

gainful employment, and that any change of employment must be reported to, and approved by, his parole agent."

Colorado—"It has been our experience that a strictly arbitrary rule or statute which requires employment as a prerequisite to parole is unrealistic and can actually frustrate future parole planning. Every case must be considered on its individual merit. Our parole board 'open dates' most cases and leaves the actual release program to the discretion of the parole department."

Hawaii—"Board requirement is that an inmate, in order to be released, must have either bona fide offer of employment or suitable board and lodging provided by someone. The latter usually means that someone is financially able to provide the necessities until the parolee becomes employed. Occasionally, when neither requirement can be met, inmate may be released if he has sufficient money to meet all normal expenses for a reasonable period of time until employment is found—approximately \$200 or more. Practically all new releases are working within two weeks following parole."

Idaho—"A prisoner shall be placed on parole only when arrangements have been made for his proper employment or for his maintenance and care, and when the Board believes that he is able and willing to fulfill the obligations of a law-abiding citizen."

Illinois—"Chapter 38, P. 807, gives board authority that arrangements shall be made for honorable and useful employment while on parole when, in its judgment, such employment is desirable or necessary in any particular case. Board rule provides that the

Division of Supervision of Parolees shall exercise its own judgment regarding employment."

Maine—"Approximately 95 per cent of those at Maine State Prison and approximately 65 per cent of those at Reformatory for Men have bona fide offers of employment before release, which offers are investigated automatically. It is highly desirable, of course, that an employment program be determined prior to release. Oftentimes, particularly at the state prison level, inmates are held overtime for lack of an employment offer. In frequent cases, the board may release without a job offer depending upon the case situation and alternatives involved. It believes this flexibility necessary, however, for its own purposes, particularly at reformatory level."

Maryland—"Normally the board requires that a suitable job be available before release is approved. However, the board may waive this and in some cases a week is given the parolee to get a job."

New Jersey—"No release on parole shall be effected . . . unless the board is reasonably satisfied that the prisoner has a suitable community parole plan with visible means of support or is likely to be suitably employed in self-sustaining employment on his release."

North Dakota—"Not much difficulty is experienced in finding immediate employment upon release."

Ohio—"Ohio does not agree with the principle of guaranteed employment being a requisite for release of an inmate on parole. Ohio contends that insistence upon such a policy is not only unrealistic but is further opposed to the basic principle of parole. It is Ohio's contention that it is ad-

visab
plan
employ
ning
the p
if th
matte
teed
part
believ
inma
hire
frien
equip
proxy
that
the d
self-d
parol
coura
his ov
lieved
not re
exami
job se
gram
ploym
tially
dustri
portu
were
the ab
Ore
a paro
to go
stituti
the pa
funds
long.
have s
home,
have c
obtain
lease c
U.S.
of Par
employ

visible wherever possible for parole planning to include guaranteed employment if such employment planning is sound, if it is in keeping with the parolee's interests and ability, and if the employer interprets the total matter with accuracy. Where guaranteed employment cannot be made a part of the release plan then it is not believed productive to penalize the inmate. Employers are reluctant to hire at 'long range' and relatives or friends of the inmate often are ill-equipped to obtain employment in proxy for the inmate. It is further held that inherent in the parole idea is the development of self-reliance and self-determination on the part of the parolee. Not only should he be encouraged and aided in the pursuit of his own employment, it is likewise believed that his status of parolee should not remove from him the element of examination and choice of his own job selection. Ohio is aided in its program of not requiring guaranteed employment for release on parole partially by the fact that it is a large industrialized state and employment opportunities are fairly stable. Even were this not true we would hold to the above."

Oregon—"We generally require that a parolee have bona fide employment to go to upon his release from the institution. One reason for this is that the parolee very seldom has sufficient funds to provide for his needs for very long. On the other hand, if he does have sufficient funds and generally a home, then we do not require that he have employment but allow him to obtain that employment after his release on parole."

U.S. Board of Parole—"The Board of Parole does not have a rule that employment *must* be obtained prior

to release, but it is the policy to have one available if possible. In certain instances, however, the board will authorize release on parole without definite employment. This is done when the parolee has sufficient funds to provide for his support, or a family to support him, until he does find employment."

Vermont—"Release on parole without employment is the exception."

Washington—"We have found over a period of years that it is unrealistic to force employment upon men while they are still in the institution. The prospective parolees will accept any kind of a job that is arranged for them in the event that they have no outside resources of their own. However, the employer's experience has been rather poor in this type of case and the employment is of real short duration. We have found that a more realistic approach is to release the men with some sort of maintenance plan such as the Salvation Army, St. Vincent de Paul, etc., so that the employers may see the man in person and so that the man may obtain his own employment."

Appendix D

REPLIES BY SIXTEEN OF EIGHTEEN JURISDICTIONS NOT REQUIRING BONA FIDE OFFER OF EMPLOYMENT BY STATUTE OR BOARD RULES, ON EXPERIENCE WITH SPECIAL COOPERATIVE PROCEDURE INVOLVING COMMUNITY AGENCIES

1. "State employment very helpful. We have had little success depending on other agencies."

2. "We do not get too much assistance from such agencies. Favorable parole plans usually come from former employers or acquaintances."

3. "Fair results. We use all agencies mentioned. We have a special

agency known as the Prison Association (a United Funds sponsored agency) that concentrates specifically on parolee employee. Our pre-parole release center which will be operated by our department is developing a specialized program."

4. "No special arrangements."

5. "We work through relatives, friends, and employment agencies."

6. "We find that we obtain very good cooperation from the State Employment Service and also receive a lot of assistance from labor unions and from the personnel departments for larger manufacturing concerns."

7. "State Employment Services co-operates, but most employment is secured through cooperative efforts of institutional parole officer, field parole offices, and the families and relatives of inmates to be paroled."

8. "No special cooperative procedures. Employment program, or proposed program, available at time, or prior to granting, of parole."

9. "Considerable cooperative procedure involving community agencies is received by the Division of Adult Paroles, as the State Employment Service has offices for industrial and agricultural placement in almost every city within the state. They are most cooperative and approximately 17 per cent of all pre-release and actual parolees out of work are serviced through this facility. Private employment agencies are rarely used as it would compete with the state service. However, some parolees will resort to these agencies to secure jobs as cooks, waiters, dishwashers, etc., in mines and logging camps in out-of-the-way places."

10. "Excellent services have been received from employment office, and local chapter of the John Howard Association."

11. "State Employment Services recently inaugurated program at state prison for aptitude testing of all inmates for job fitness; Salvation Army also cooperative. Good results. Other instances of cooperation too isolated to permit generalization."

12. "Prospective parolees registered with Employment Service before leaving institution. Such applicants referred to special counselors upon release. Private agencies, religious agencies, and the facilities of the parole bureau are also used. The program is effective."

13. "Fairly strong liaison exists between parole and state employment agencies. Employment placement and resource development a strong requirement for parole officers. If employment resources unavailable and parolee status critical, state makes use of temporary placement with Salvation Army, Volunteers of America; also, other community resources such as welfare agencies. Full-time employment placement executive planned for parole staff."

14. "Ninety per cent of our work is done with the parolee: counseling, suggestions on how to seek employment, encouragement."

15. "We have arranged with the Employment Security Department to assist our parolees and probationers as much as possible. We are developing local community committees to assist with employment in worthy cases. This is in its infancy; however, the Congregational Church has taken a definite interest and now has one pilot project in this area."

16. "State Employment Service, private welfare agencies, religious agencies. Results fairly good on all three. Best results secured by direct contact of our men with personnel managers."

REPR
JURIS
FIDE
STAT
ARRA

1.
qual
2.
ever,
ance
same

3.
Depa
ADC
funds
and n
a cas
until
housi
has b

4.
lem i
of in
assist

5.
apply
if the

6.
agenc
depen
lease.

7.
cult t
maint

with
for th
unem

8.
out w
ment

for ge
ance b
the w
In the

Appendix E

REPLIES BY FIFTEEN OF EIGHTEEN JURISDICTIONS NOT REQUIRING BONA FIDE OFFERS OF EMPLOYMENT BY STATUTE OR BOARD RULE, ON SPECIFIC ARRANGEMENTS WITH PUBLIC WELFARE DEPARTMENTS

1. "None except those who can qualify for pension or social security."

2. "No specific arrangements; however, if he and family in need of assistance we endeavor to help secure same."

3. "No arrangement with Welfare Department except where family on ADC. Our Prison Association has funds available for temporary housing and meals. Generally, we do not accept a case into our respective districts until either a family arrangement for housing or a collateral arrangement has been verified."

4. "State has not experienced problem in this area. Relatives and friends of inmate generally provide financial assistance."

5. "Parolees who are in need may apply for relief, which will be granted if they qualify otherwise."

6. "None. State and/or welfare agencies, ADC, etc., sustain parolee's dependents thirty days following release. Specific aid to the parolee difficult to obtain."

7. "Close working relationship is maintained for the unattached parolee with the Welfare Department both for the employable and the so-called unemployable groups."

8. "A procedure has been worked out with the Public Assistance Department whereby any man who qualifies for general assistance or old age assistance before release is processed so that the welfare checks start immediately. In the event that the man is released

without employment and continues unemployed for some time no special arrangements have been made since these persons have to qualify under the regular welfare rules."

9. "Families generally provide assistance. Public aid may be secured from Department of Public Welfare."

10. "Very little arrangement with public welfare departments relative to obtaining financial assistance for men out of work. Aid for room and board is lent to the parolee by his parole agent. The caseworker is aware of the need, and portions this assistance as need requires until work is obtained. Where the parolee has a family and is in need, he is referred to the county welfare department, which takes over until employment has been obtained."

11. "Financial assistance from public welfare department is given only to the physically disabled as determined by agency policy. If able-bodied only temporary assistance is given until recipient receives his first pay check."

12. "Welfare departments are most cooperative."

13. "We have never found it necessary to make any arrangements with a public welfare department for financial assistance for those persons who are released without employment as in such cases we would require employment before release."

14. "No such individual financial assistance but ADC payments from social welfare department to parolee's family continue for a month following release."

15. "Family usually receiving welfare assistance, which is continued for a month at least or until parolee obtains employment and is able to assume financial support."

Parole Release without Employment

LEONARD R. WITT

Supervisor of Parole Placement, New York State Division of Parole

THE New York State Division of Parole has been studying the problem of employment of prospective parolees, in an attempt to find some way of coping with the mounting numbers of inmates approved for parole but "held over" because they had no jobs. Guaranteed employment was a condition for parole release from state correctional institutions under the jurisdiction of the parole board.

A survey of the policies of forty-eight parole jurisdictions on employment as a condition of parole indicated that in most jurisdictions policies are flexible.¹ Parole without employment, under certain conditions, is permitted by statute or parole board rule or parole board discretion. Although there is a lack of information pertaining to experience with parole release without employment, the findings of the survey encouraged the New York parole board to set up a policy of parole release without employment, for selected employable inmates, when circumstances indicate that they are likely to secure employment soon after release. The policy is known as Reasonable Assurance Release.

R.A.R. Program Procedure

Institutional and field parole staff may recommend candidates for release: their selection must be reviewed and approved by the area director and

a member of the board. The following considerations guide the selection of inmates:

1. Reasonable Assurance Release may be granted if the inmate has a relatively stable home situation, or has other resources which indicate that he will not immediately become a public charge.

2. It may be granted if the inmate has a marketable employment skill or when there is reason to believe that upon his arrival in the community he will be able to secure his own employment through his family, through employment agencies, or through personal contact with prospective employers.

3. It may be granted if a community agency has indicated an interest in an inmate and is willing to help with his placement when he is released.²

The parole officer tells each inmate going on Reasonable Assurance Release that he must make every effort to get employment for himself and must cooperate with the field staff when they try to help him get a job. The officer tells him he will have to keep a daily log of his efforts to get a job and makes sure he understands there will be no hesitation in revok-

² Before it adopted the Reasonable Assurance Release policy the parole board considered parole programs which did not include guaranteed employment when a reputable community agency promised to help the parolee get a job. The Reasonable Assurance Release procedure gave formal recognition to the practice.

¹ See pp. 159-169 above, L. Stanley Clevenger and John M. Stanton, "Should an Inmate Have a Job before Being Released on Parole?"

ing his parole if he shows signs of malingering.

The parolees report to their parole officers for guidance as often as necessary but at least once a week.

If the R.A.R. parolee is still unemployed at the end of two weeks from the date of release, the parole officer, while continuing his own efforts, refers him to the parole employment officer for priority employment service.

For some time the parole division has had a small specialized staff of parole employment officers whose primary duty has been to give vocational and job placement services to prospective parolees who need assistance. This staff continues to give service to inmates who are not considered suitable prospects for release without employment.

Study of the R.A.R. Program

The parole division studied the carefully controlled Reasonable Assurance Release program during its first six months of operation to evaluate the resources effective in helping parolees secure employment and to measure the incidence of delinquency with initial unemployment for parolees released without jobs.

A record was kept of the parolees released in accordance with the Reasonable Assurance Release procedure.³ The offenders were released to various parts of New York State—the majority to the New York City metro-

politan area. Most of the parolees had approved residences to go to, although some homeless ones had to have furnished rooms. The parolees' criminal backgrounds were varied.

The area offices used a standard form to record the following information:

1. Time lapse between the date of release on parole and the date that bona fide employment was secured.
2. Source of employment.
3. Time lapse between the date of release and the date of delinquency (new arrest or technical parole violation) when the delinquency occurred before the parolee secured bona fide employment.

The incidence of delinquency after bona fide employment was secured was not studied. The incidence of delinquency with initial lack of bona fide employment was investigated. For the study, bona fide employment was defined as verified employment of a kind which would have qualified the offender for the usual release on parole. In measuring the time lapse, we counted all calendar days.

Results

From February 4 to August 4, 1959, 241 offenders were released on parole on the Reasonable Assurance Release program. Of these, 221 (92 per cent) did secure bona fide employment.

Table I shows how long it took the parolees to secure employment and what means they used to get jobs. The first line shows that forty-four parolees found jobs within five days after their release; 193 (87 per cent) found jobs within thirty days after release. The time lapse ranged from one to eighty days; the average was sixteen days.

Table I also shows that 167 (76 per cent) of the parolees secured jobs

³ During the period of the study sixty-six inmates were released on parole to have immediate placement assistance from the New York State Employment Service in the metropolitan area, in accordance with a special agreement and liaison arrangement. None of the sixty-six cases is included in the study described above. For a description of the cooperative project, see Arthur Mann and William G. Rafferty, "A State Employment Program for the Offender," pp. 175-180 below.

TABLE I
PAROLEES RELEASED WITHOUT JOBS AND SECURING BONA FIDE EMPLOYMENT

| No. of Days after Release | Source of Employment | | | | | Other | Total Employed |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------|--------|------------|-------|-------------------|
| | Parolee's Efforts | Family, Friends | P.O. | P.E.O. | N.Y.S.E.S. | | |
| 1-5 | 30 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 44 |
| 6-10 | 42 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1* | 51 |
| 11-15 | 31 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 42 |
| 16-20 | 17 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 21-25 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 21 |
| 26-30 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 31-35 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 36-40 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 41-45 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 46-50 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 51-55 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 56-60 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 66-70 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 71-75 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 76-80 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Totals | 167 | 7 | 23 | 14 | 9 | 1 | 221 |

* Placed in employment by N.Y.C. Welfare Dept.

TABLE II
**PAROLEES RELEASED WITHOUT JOBS AND FAILING TO SECURE
BONA FIDE EMPLOYMENT**

| No. of Days after Release | New Arrest | Technical Parole Violation | No Delinquency | Total |
|------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------|
| 1-5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 6-10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 11-15 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 16-20 | 1 | 4 | 1* | 6 |
| 21-25 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 41-45 | 0 | 1 | 1** | 2 |
| 46-50 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 121-125 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Totals | 4 | 14 | 2 | 20 |

* Parolee killed in fight 16 days after release.

** Parolee unemployed at time of parole discharge (expiration of sentence), 45 days after release.

through their own efforts. The figure for employment through "Family, Friends" must be interpreted with caution. This category was not clearly defined, and probably more than seven parolees secured jobs through definite job leads and solicitations by family members and friends. Parole officers (P.O.) and parole employment officers (P.E.O.) found jobs for thirty-seven (17 per cent) of the group by soliciting employers. The New York State Employment Service (N. Y. S. E. S.) found employment for nine parolees who came to it as regular job applicants.

Table II summarizes the data on the eighteen parolees (7 per cent of the 241 offenders released without jobs) who did not secure employment and were declared delinquent (four for a new arrest and fourteen for technical violations of parole) within a little more than four months after release. Details of the four new arrests are as follows:

Possession of switch blade—11 days after release.

Shoplifting—17 days after release.

Grand larceny—50 days after release.

Speeding and unlawful use of motor vehicle—124 days after release.

Most of the fourteen technical violators of parole had absconded or were found to be malingering. Not all of the eighteen who were declared delinquent were returned to prison.

Table II shows that ten, or 56 per cent, of the delinquencies occurred sixteen or more days after date of release. Tables I and II show a total of 96 cases recorded at and beyond the 16-20 day interval, and the ten delinquent cases amount to approximately 10 per cent of this total.

Summary and Conclusions

The study shows that 92 per cent of the parolees secure employment and are not arrested or cited for parole violation during the immediate post-release period of unemployment, which is, on an average, sixteen days. It justifies a parole policy permitting the release of selected inmates, without employment, on the basis of reasonable assurance that they will secure employment soon after release.

It shows, too, that most parolees will secure employment through their own resources—by their own efforts, or through friends and family contacts. In all, 174 (about 79 per cent) of the parolees studied found their jobs by themselves or through their families or friends. (Many of the parolees credited with securing their own jobs got them after and as a result of guidance from parole and employment officers.)

The results show that while only 7 per cent of all Reasonable Assurance Release parolees became delinquent, extended unemployment increases the chances of delinquency. About 10 per cent of all the parolees who do not get jobs within fifteen days after their release either are arrested for new crimes or are cited as technical parole violators. But the primary cause of delinquency is not the stress and hardship which result from unemployment. Malingers—parolees who avoid work—are among those who are eventually cited as technical parole violators or are involved in new crimes.

The fact that Reasonable Assurance Release parolees are a special treatment group may account for the success of the program. The cases are closely controlled and parolees receive intensive guidance, counseling, and

YMENT

Total
Employed

44
51
42
22
21
13
13
4
2
1
3
2
1
1
1

221

E

Total

5
1
2
6
2
2
1
1

20

days after release

job placement services from parole staff. Offenders granted the privilege of release without employment are obligated to make determined efforts to secure work, and to cooperate to this end with parole staff. The psychological effect of this privilege, too, may be to restrain them from parole violation and from misconduct leading to new arrest.

The findings of the study are not construed as evidence that inmates' preparole efforts to find employment are unnecessary. Employment planning by offenders still in an institution is a sound practice, important in the rehabilitation process. Most inmates are capable of developing their own employment programs. However, each inmate should be encouraged to look for a job which will satisfy his vocational and social needs, and so contribute to his adjustment on parole. Too often inmates look for jobs which are unrelated to their interests and

abilities, and which, at best, make for stopgap employment on parole. An inflexible policy which requires guaranteed employment for parole release encourages this approach. For when an offender's failure to secure employment involves his prolonged confinement, he will hardly have a selective or discriminating approach to getting a job.

In New York State the trend is toward development of a highly effective parole system which "guarantees" parole release for all deserving inmates without undue delay. The system, characterized by special employment services and programs, gives increased incentive to inmates to seek employment related to their interests, abilities, or vocational objectives. This approach to employment by offenders is the ideal in view of increasing evidence that success on parole (or general adjustment) is closely related to job satisfaction (or vocational adjustment).

I
n
facto
puni
book
defin
of o
ject
lar t
Statu
recti
Servi
look
speci
the o

C.
York
laun
sult
depa
and
jor p

1.
work
gaini
the r
tion
crim

2.
shou
prov
train
flict

3.
a Co
tion
ance,

A State Employment Program for the Offender

ARTHUR MANN AND WILLIAM G. RAFFERTY
*Employment Consultants (Parole), Division of Employment
New York State Department of Labor*

IN MODERN civilization employment is often one of the prime factors of reward, recognition, and punishment. Anne Roe, in her recent book, *Psychology of Occupations*, has defined the psychological importance of occupations in society. This subject has even become a highly popular topic in such best sellers as *The Status Seekers*. New York State's Correctional Vocational Rehabilitation Service is a practical and forward-looking program that recognizes the special importance of employment to the offender.

C.R.V.S.

C.R.V.S., an extension of the New York State Employment Service, was launched in August, 1956, as the result of an agreement among the state departments of Correction and Labor and the Division of Parole. These major points were established:

1. Offenders' acquisition of sound working habits and skills, and their gainful employment, can be among the most effective aids in the prevention and treatment of delinquency and crime.
2. The parties to the agreement should pool their resources to help provide occupational training or re-training for those who come into conflict with the law.
3. To implement these resolutions, a Correctional Vocational Rehabilitation Service will offer training, guidance, and employment opportunities

to probationers, prisoners, and parolees.

At the request of the parole and correctional agencies the Labor Department's New York State Employment Service initiated the new program.

The Employment Service is a public agency which provides many special programs in addition to standard placement assistance. Among these various activities are programs of counseling, testing, and occupational analysis, as well as special placement services for veterans, for the disabled, and for older workers. The Employment Service was able to take on yet another program because it is a well-staffed and thoroughly integrated agency, able to absorb new programs and translate theory into practice logically and economically. In 1958 it made approximately 884,000 placements. This is certainly big business. To maintain such a program, the Service operates on an annual budget of about \$14 million and maintains a staff of about 2,100 employees. In-service training programs, qualified personnel, constant research, and modern public relations techniques are hallmarks of the agency's operations.

Correctional and parole authorities believed that the Employment Service would be particularly effective in the rehabilitation of offenders. Since it is not directly related to the correctional agencies, the service would help job-hunting offenders in a nonpenal atmosphere. And it would give sympa-

thetic consideration to the offender seeking employment.

Services Offered

The Employment Service offers the following assistance to the probation, correctional, and parole agencies:

1. Through seminars on the techniques of vocational counseling and placement, it trains correctional staff to evaluate the aptitudes, skills, and interests of probationers, prisoners, and parolees.

2. It arranges for probationers, parolees, and institutional discharges to be referred to local employment offices of the State Employment Service. In the local offices, staff who show interest in offenders' problems have been trained, as correctional liaisons, to give special counseling and placement assistance to offenders. Offices with more than one liaison also have a correctional coordinator.

C.V.R.S. procedures have been experimental and flexible, according to the needs of the particular probation agency or institution. It holds preliminary meetings with correctional agency directors, Employment Service administrative staff, and in some cases with the judges of the various courts concerned. These meetings survey the needs and employment problems of the offender. Subsequently, C.V.R.S. personnel conduct training sessions for the probation officers. An employment consultant usually helps the probation agency to establish procedures, train personnel, and set up a liaison between the staff of the agency and C.V.R.S.

These training sessions introduce probation officers to the Employment Service's methods and referral forms, and study the techniques of counseling. Probation officers are given the names of the C.V.R.S. liaisons in the various employment offices to whom

they will refer job-seekers. In most cases the probation agency keeps a monthly statistical form on referrals made under the C.V.R.S. program.

The parole employment officers of the Division of Parole also refer parolees to the C.V.R.S. liaisons for placement. In New York City parole officers assigned to a Special Narcotics Unit use these facilities too. In addition, parole and parole employment officers get job leads from the C.V.R.S. in order to secure employment for prisoners awaiting release.

In April, 1959, C.V.R.S. broadened its services to the parole division. Each week since then, a C.V.R.S. staff member has assisted some prisoners approved by the parole board for release on a "reasonable assurance" basis (that is, release without having a definite job offer). Immediately after their release, these parolees are referred to Employment Service offices to find work. Many of those so assisted are homeless, with only enough prison earnings to carry them along for little more than a week; early re-employment is imperative.

Between May and December, 1959, 233 offenders were given "reasonable assurance" releases. Of this number, 132 found jobs through the Employment Service, sixty-eight found work on their own or through other sources, and seventeen were parole violators. The remaining group of sixteen cases consists of those who failed to report to the Employment Service or to a job, those who could not report because of illness or injury, and those who had warrants enforced against them.

3. The Employment Service also conducts surveys of vocational training programs in various institutions to determine whether they are realistically geared to the current labor market demand. Technological changes have been so rapid in recent

years that, in some prisons in New York State, courses have become obsolete and training equipment outmoded. In other cases, the basic prison industry has become outmoded.

When surveying an institution, the C.V.R.S. studies the courses given, the type of machinery used, and other aspects of the vocational program to see how well they fit the requirement of employers in various industries. They often take note, too, of personality problems which make certain inmates unable to participate successfully in the institution's training program. Where feasible, the surveys suggest alternate, more appropriate training.

Survey reports are then discussed in round-table fashion with Department of Correction and Employment Service representatives. A final survey report, jointly approved by the agencies, becomes a tool for the Department of Correction's future vocational planning.

4. Correctional institutions hold group counseling sessions for prerelease inmates under C.V.R.S. auspices. At these meetings, the prisoners' interests are explored and a C.V.R.S. representative provides pertinent information on employment opportunities in their home towns.

Accomplishments

From its work so far, the C.V.R.S. can point to these achievements:

1. It has made vocational training surveys in nine prisons and reformatories, and submitted reports on each to the Department of Correction.

2. It has arranged placement projects with a federal correctional institution, two voluntary training schools, two city and two county penitentiaries, six probation areas, and two parole agencies. In most cases, when

setting up a project it gave correctional staff orientation in techniques of vocational counseling and placement.

3. A C.V.R.S. representative visits one state prison and one state reformatory each month. On these visits he conducts prerelease group sessions for inmates on the labor market demand and job finding techniques. Similar sessions are also held at intervals, when requested, for local, state, or federal institutions.

Staff and Statistics

The C.V.R.S. staff is under the general supervision of Janet I. Pinner, Director of Selective Placement, Department of Labor, who supervises the program for handicapped persons. The C.V.R.S. is an extension of this selective placement service because the offender, too, faces a social and occupational handicap.

Technical supervision of the program is in the hands of two employment consultants with many years of experience in correction and job placement. On the firing line in our local offices are the correctional liaisons and coordinators. In New York City a staff of thirty-five perform the duties of coordinator and liaison. Outside the City, one staff member in each local employment office is designated as liaison for C.V.R.S.

Cooperating agencies make approximately 200 referrals monthly to the C.V.R.S.; placements average 50 per cent. These figures are a minimum measure of services rendered. Some of the correctional agencies do not have enough time to keep accurate statistics of the referrals to the Employment Service. Applicants may return to the C.V.R.S. liaisons more than once and receive additional referrals (which are not always reported). As a result of the

Employment Service's initial placement, too, some applicants develop new skills and secure better jobs. Special aptitude testing and counseling are available when needed.

Some Case Studies

A majority of the persons referred to the Employment Service are unskilled—the "marginal" workers whose record is one of drifting from job to job with no apparent vocational plan. These people have failed consistently: in school, in the home, in society. They have never learned how to compete. Very often their need for patience and understanding is far beyond that of the usual job applicant. They require the understanding of prospective employers, too; when jobs are being solicited for offenders the employers are informed of their background. The special techniques of counseling this type of job applicant have unusual impact, although the only observable result is the undramatic report that the applicant is working steadily. The following case histories may give a better picture of the problems presented and the attempts made to solve them:

CASE A

Bill, now nineteen, had been supporting his family since he was sixteen. His mother and father were alcoholics; they had expressed little interest in their three children. On the recommendation of the probation authorities the judge had sent Bill at age twelve to training school, not for the superficial complaint of truancy that had been lodged against him, but because home conditions were so bad that any other place could give him better food, lodging, and treatment. Both Bill and his younger brother had had various scrapes with the law since the age of sixteen. As Bill said, "When

I work, I'm king; when I don't, she tells me I'm a bum and throws me out of the house without feeding me. Sometimes she don't even let me come home. Now, I ask you—what kind of mother is that?"

For his latest offense—association with a street gang which had been causing trouble in the neighborhood—Bill had been placed on probation. Authorities had referred him to C.V.R.S.

He was an alert, fine-looking boy, gregarious, although defensive and somewhat aggressive. He had been working in a brush and glue factory for about six months. The smell of the glue so affected him that he suffered from loss of appetite and a stomach disorder. He hated the routine work, the lack of contact with people, and the lack of physical activity. In frustration, he quit.

How many of us, at that age, would have stuck it out as long as he did?

Employment Service aptitude tests and counseling revealed strong interests in selling and auto repair, and the capacities for both. The possibility of working at a job which could be interesting as well as profitable excited him.

Fortunately, the Employment Service was able to place him on a job that combined the two: as a salesman trainee and installer of small auto parts in a large chain store.

CASE B

Tony's was an interesting case. He was a chronic alcoholic and an epileptic. Scheduled for release after serving a short sentence for nonsupport and vagrancy, he was fearful—and with good reason. He had his chronic handicap, his alcoholism, and no funds or family waiting for him.

After his release the community helped by providing a temporary resi-

deno
redu
not
batio
and
Serv
ploy
Ton
to th
as a
opm
A.A.

TI
won
his
shor
And
him

CI
his m
in a
he h
on a
ian
dicar
ism.
priso
enou

As
C.V.
disch
was
ance
job a
the e
dent
an o
is sa
work
less
ness.

Jo
priso
influ
histo
and

dence and a supply of medicine to reduce his seizures. Although he was not under supervision, the local probation officer took an interest in him and suggested he ask the Employment Service for job-finding help. The Employment Service liaison referred Tony to three different jobs. He stuck to the last one: a residential position as a porter in a private housing development. He also became a member of A.A.

There's no guarantee that Tony won't backslide and lose this job; but his present adjustment, even for a short period of time, is encouraging. And the C.V.R.S. will be ready to help him if he does slip again.

CASE C

Clint was discharged after serving his maximum sentence of nine months in an institution. Prior to his offense, he had served many years in the Army on a job not easily translated to civilian life. He had no family. His predicament could be traced to alcoholism. When he was discharged from prison his funds were meager, only enough to carry him for a day or two.

As instructed, Clint reported to the C.V.R.S. liaison the day after he was discharged. Since the problem here was to get immediate financial assistance, he was referred to a temporary job as a dishwasher. In the meantime, the C.V.R.S. liaison found him a residential job as a maintenance man at an out-of-town hotel. On this job Clint is saving money, building up a good work reference for the future, and has less opportunity to indulge his weakness.

CASE D

John R., thirty-four, was sent to prison for robbery while under the influence of liquor. He had a previous history of offenses in the Marine Corps and two arrests after his service dis-

charge, both involving alcohol and burglary. Psychological tests in prison revealed John to be highly intelligent but severely neurotic. He had many natural aptitudes but seemed unable to use any of them in employment. He went from job to job, often taking on skilled work which he was unable to handle because of his lack of qualifications.

The institution's re-evaluation of his interests and aptitudes indicated that he had a great interest in leathercraft work and also related well to people. The institution furnished him with leather supplies and equipment, and gave him some basic training in making various leather goods such as wallets and ladies' handbags; at the same time he received intensive therapy and counseling. He progressed so well that he was able to conduct a class in leathercraft. On discharge he asked the C.V.R.S. for this type of employment. Since he needed money as quickly as possible, we found him a temporary job as a construction laborer. A correctional liaison then found work for him in a store which sold leather products, where, in addition to selling, John would instruct customers in the use of various leather goods.

Thus John now has a job which puts him in contact with people and gives him an opportunity to use his institutionally acquired skills.

Vocational Problems

For convenience, the problems of vocational training and placement of offenders in New York State can be regarded as institutional and civilian.

Among the institutional problems are the difficulties of recruiting certified instructional staff because of salary and location, and the drawbacks of placing inmates in teaching posts to supplement the few instruc-

tors the prisons can afford; limited budgets that do not provide for gradual replacement of worn-out or obsolete equipment and machines; and, in general, insufficient material and services for adequate vocational training.

Obstacles to the employment of offenders in civilian life include the difficulties of obtaining licenses for the professions and for occupations such as barber, beautician, and nurse, and the difficulty of getting motor vehicle licenses for truck drivers, auto mechanics, and taxi drivers. Added stumbling blocks are hiring policies that deny offenders employment in public institutions or with firms doing classified government contract work.

If convicted of felonies and certain misdemeanors, they are also barred from working in the manufacture, distribution, and sale of alcoholic beverages.

These are a few of the problems. No doubt persons with experience in the correctional field can suggest many more. To alleviate or eliminate them we must have a coordinated and sustained offensive, in which the ball carriers are the correctional agencies, public and private, and the goal is to educate employers, unions, government, and the general public to an awareness of the situation, and to enlist their aid in returning the offender to his place in society.

Who Shall Find Jobs for Parolees?

G. I. GIARDINI

Superintendent of Parole Supervision, Pennsylvania Board of Parole

CORRECTIONAL workers agree that employment is crucial to the rehabilitation of offenders both during imprisonment and after release. They regard it as a basic requisite in almost any program of social or psychological treatment. But there is less agreement among them on the question of whose responsibility it is to obtain jobs for offenders, especially for offenders applying and selected for parole.

At this point we are dealing mostly with adults who are selected for parole because of their readiness to face social responsibilities outside of prison. Nevertheless, persons convicted of crime have difficulty finding jobs because of the community's deep-seated prejudice against them. Employers, as a rule, merely tend to follow the community in their attitude toward ex-convicts. Most employers, too, require an interview with the prospective employee as a preliminary to hiring—a condition that is physically impossible for a prisoner to meet. It is for these reasons primarily that some correctional workers have taken the view that to expect offenders, especially those still in institutions, to find jobs for themselves is to ask for the impossible.

Where this view prevails, those charged with the responsibility of releasing offenders from institutions have resolved the problem of employment by one of two alternatives. Some authorities have, in substance, removed the requirement of

employment as a condition for release. Others have hired employment specialists to whittle down employer resistance and get jobs for prospective parolees.

On the other hand, many correctional workers take the view that an important objective of a correctional program is to get the offender to face reality, and accept the fact that he is responsible for his own behavior. In fact, if he is to be released at all, he *must* be held responsible for his behavior; there can be no other basis for release. We hope that the correctional program will provide opportunities for socially acceptable changes in and growth of the prisoner's personality; but we still hold him responsible for his success or failure in achieving rehabilitation. A major object of personality growth is the readiness and capacity to assume social responsibilities. Finding a job is a responsibility that the offender, like everyone else, must assume sooner or later—the sooner the better.

Role of the Institution

The institution should provide services which will help the offender to adapt himself in the community. Among other things, it should provide him with an opportunity to select and be trained in a vocation or to improve his skills in a vocation already learned. It should have facilities for training in a variety of occupations. The offender's choice of an occupation should be made on the basis of scien-

tific vocational counseling rather than on that of his subjective likes and dislikes, and should take into account whether the community to which he will return is a market for the skills he will have. It is important also that the offender be taught how to seek or ask for a job. Every candidate for parole should have the skill of presenting prospective employers with the kind of information they want of a parolee. Letters to employers must reflect frankness and sincerity in order to sell whatever skills the applicant has. The same qualities should impress the employer in a personal interview.

In short the institution is responsible for providing the inmate with the skills and techniques of getting and keeping a job. Except in certain types of cases, it is not responsible for getting a job for him.

Responsibility of Parole Applicant

One way of testing an applicant's readiness for parole is to hold him responsible for finding employment while still in prison. He may have to write letters to anyone who is likely to respond to his pleas—relatives, friends, former employers. Our experience in Pennsylvania has been that a majority of inmates—approximately 70 per cent—get promises of employment that stand up under investigation. Some write many letters before they receive a favorable reply. When he receives an offer of employment, the prisoner gives the letter to the institutional parole officer who refers it to the Board of Parole field office for investigation.

The facility with which a prisoner obtains promise of employment and provision for other parts of the parole plan may be taken as a measure of the community's readiness or willingness

to receive him. With some exceptions, offenders with long criminal records and those falling in the category of social derelicts find it more difficult to develop parole plans than do other kinds of offenders.

Role of Parole Agency

Probably no parole agency has a policy of absolutely no release without employment. Allowances are made for the physically and mentally handicapped offenders who are otherwise parolable, and for a number of parole applicants who, because of their youth and lack of work experience in the community, have difficulty in obtaining a promise of employment; if temporary support for them can be provided by relatives, they should be paroled without employment. Those who have an excellent past work record or some scarce skill can also be paroled without employment.

On the other hand, many parole applicants among the derelict and "hardened" offender groups must have employment upon release but cannot get jobs in spite of all their efforts. It is for this group of applicants that some states have created the position of employment specialist. This person, usually working from a central office of a parole board, occasionally from an institution, is responsible for developing contacts with employers and for building up a reservoir of jobs for parole candidates. The employment specialist, being trained in vocational counseling, would have knowledge of occupational resources in the different communities and of the skills required for various occupations, and would be in a position to fit the skills of the applicant to the needs of the employer, thus satisfying both employer and employee. So the argument runs.

There is no question that those parole applicants who are unable to develop parole plans, but are otherwise deemed parolable, must have some help in obtaining employment—at least while they are still in prison. I agree that this responsibility falls on the parole board. When a parole applicant has exhausted his resources in parole planing and the parole board regards him as a parolable subject, the institution may properly transfer the responsibility for developing a plan to the parole board and its field staff. It seems to me that the mobilization of a parole field staff is the surest and most direct way of finding jobs for parole applicants who cannot find jobs on their own initiative.

Our experience in Pennsylvania tends to confirm this belief. In August, 1956, the number of paroled prisoners who had been held more than six months beyond the parole date because they did not have parole plans reached 400. In most of the cases, the parole candidate was not able to obtain promise of a job. The board decided to assume the responsibility for these cases by coordinating the services of the district offices more closely with the work of the parole officers in the institutions. The parole agents were asked to find the jobs. On December 31, 1959, only seven candidates were in the held-over category.

Role of Parole Officer

Unlike the employment specialist, who deals largely with employers, the parole officer works with the whole community in behalf of the parolee, before and after his release, but has in mind primarily the ultimate welfare of the community. He has direct personal relations with all employers in his territory, as well as with the

personnel of public and private employment agencies, but the effective parole officer is able to mobilize all usable community resources, not just employment resources. His constant concern is to mold community attitudes so that the released prisoner is accepted as one ready and able to resume his responsibilities as a citizen, and one who has therefore a right to work and earn an honest living. Within the framework of its own laws, the community has a duty to provide the released offender with employment. In so far as the parole officer succeeds in creating this point of view in the community, he will be successful, not only in getting jobs for parolees, but also in helping them toward a total social readjustment. I cannot conceive of an employment specialist producing as favorable a climate as this for a parole applicant or a parolee, even within the restricted area of employment.

Correctional workers should be even more discriminating in helping men on parole than in helping those still in prison. Since the goal of parole supervision is to help the parolee achieve an independent life within the limits set by his society, the parole officer must be wary of extending help when it is not needed. Parolees should be encouraged to go as far as they can to help themselves. They certainly should be encouraged to find their own jobs. It is not a fixed responsibility of the parole officer to find jobs for them. It is his responsibility to impart techniques and knowledge that will enable parolees to find their own jobs. He is not expected to impart trade skills to them; he is expected to know where and how they can get trade training. Thus the parole officer need not be an occupational specialist, but he must know about the training and

skills of the parolees he supervises. He must be able to describe these to a prospective employer if a parolee is not capable of doing this for himself.

Other Resources

I conclude that an employment specialist in a parole system is superfluous because trained and experienced parole officers can find employment for parole applicants and for parolees more easily, more effectively, and perhaps more economically than the specialist. The only cogent argument for employing a specialist is that parole officers are already overloaded. But we agree that caseloads should be reduced: they should be reduced sufficiently to permit parole officers to help in finding jobs for parole applicants and parolees *when necessary*.

There are other reasons for not using an employment specialist. Numerous private employment offices will

find jobs for parole applicants and parolees for a reasonable fee. Unions also provide employment services. Furthermore, every state already has public employment offices. Some of these have special units for applicants for parole and parolees. All state employment offices have trained personnel, skilled in interviewing and in evaluating the skills of job seekers. So the taxpayer has already provided the services we seek. Why should he be burdened with an additional cost for service of the same kind? Furthermore, why should the offender be given more special services than are already available? If the full service of the state employment service is not available to the parole applicant—arrangement of necessary interviews is sometimes impossible—the institution or the parole board can remedy this by better public relations.

Problems of Getting Jobs for Parolees

ROBERT R. HANNUM

Director of Vocational Placement, The Osborne Association, Inc.

MOST of us tend to resist change. The training experts point out that a worker is willing to accept a new method only if he is convinced that it will make his task easier or safer, or both. Any attempt to change a method in any other way is doomed to failure in the long run. This principle can be applied to prison therapy, or to probation and parole. Is there really any correction, after all, unless the offender decides it is easier or safer, or both, to observe the rights of others?

The title of this article expresses a traditional—and careless—attitude. It innocently takes for granted a basis for extraordinary cooperation by business people and organizations. It reflects the shaky old notion that someone in a profit-making industry must be found who will hire parolees, as such, rather than the values which most parolees actually possess by way of experience, training, capacity, and desire. It begs, it beseeches, it hopes for management to be philanthropic, to hire some poor parolee just because he needs a job. After all, isn't the businessman part of the community? Doesn't he owe it his cooperation? Won't he please reach down and help the miscreant whether he has any real values or not?

This attitude may have stemmed originally from the eagerness and kindness of some private citizen or a parole supervisor who wanted to help a man get on a payroll. But let's examine the problem from the stand-

point of "easier and safer." In doing so, the writer hopes that the service and experience of a prisoners' aid society—The Osborne Association—may promote the growth of a method which will effect the long-term security of present and future offenders. It may even help reduce that old plague—recidivism.

Something of Value

When we take stock of what is happening in the correctional field today, we find that definite improvements are taking place in every single phase of this giant operation. We seem to be getting somewhere, and we can prove it. We are actually making progress in affecting the attitudes of a larger percentage of those whom it is our privilege to serve.

We like to use terms like "therapy" and "treatment"; yet, when "the patient" has come through the gate, many of us still fail to acknowledge his true value and dignity.

Perhaps some of us are reluctant to have faith in our product because our profession deals with sin, the devil, and the dungeon. Some even conclude that it is unethical not to advertise the sinner as such, and permanently; however penitent or corrected he may be, he must first be described as "a parolee," "a convict," or "an ex-con."

Innumerable letters have been written and phone calls made to businessmen to find out whether they would be willing to hire "a convict," "a parolee," or perhaps "a problem boy."

Many of these communications have omitted any statement of values whatsoever, or have deliberately de-emphasized good or fairly good skills. The proponent has not prepared himself to know anything about the capacities required to make the employer's products; his approach is simply one of urging or begging the employer to participate in a nebulous adventure too often called "rehabilitation." He has ignored the real values, the very foundation of security-through-production, of the human being who, almost invariably, has something of value to offer. Has he not been sloppy, then, in handling his obligation to the community? And has he not weakened his own ability to supervise? He certainly has made his own responsibility tougher by avoiding, devaluating, or belittling his parolee's real assets. And these capacities are the only elements that should attract a businessman.

Safer, Easier

It takes common sense, good interviewing ability, facts, and the use of a reasonable amount of patience, understanding, time, and effort—characteristics which are already part of the professional kit of any worker who puts into practice the principles of sound casework—to determine these values. And if they were applied as they are supposed to be, the case analysis would pay less attention to the names of "siblings" and more attention to the facts about a man's ability to make a living for himself and his dependents.

Services like ours know it is best for most clients to exhaust their own resources as thoroughly as possible. Like most modern authoritative agencies, we do everything possible and necessary to prepare a man to fight his own battle toward obtaining suitable employment.

The average unemployed nonoffender is a poor salesman of his own values to industry; even more inept is the new arrival from a correctional institution. Every probation and parole officer knows the satisfaction that comes from putting a man at his ease, helping him clarify his own skills, estimating them accurately, and then helping him to prepare for a satisfactory interview at his local State Employment Service or to visit selected employers, unions, etc., on his own. Parole officers are usually trained, or should train themselves, to encourage and teach their clients about how to present their assets first, and then their disabilities (spiritual, physical, or correctional) as and when necessary, to the right person and in the right way. The importance of good rapport needs no underlining here; but the ability to assist a client with decisions related to his occupational choice can often provide a platform on which to build or relate the other important aspects of a healthy parole relationship.

Parole board executives, ideally, are capable human beings, but few have either the time or the experience for evaluating skills accurately. They should be encouraged to ask for "Employment Abstracts" for perusal before a parole hearing. This kind of enlightening summary—a list of the significant details of the candidate's education, training, institutional assignments, and past employment history—was developed and is currently used in the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Its likeness can be made by institutional parole officers or classification officers, with the help of correctional industry representatives or other assignment supervisors. Aside from its value to the parole board, it can also avoid waste of time and effort by

super
muni
or pr

In
instr
inform
status
early
rather
man's
specif
indef
officer
self)
penol
call.
ally f
pitia
habili
if an
appli
produ
busin
not e
ing o
detai
other
know

We
this a
ful. A
outri
both
wond
are u
resea
from
"Doe
prob
perce
cause
how
or in
quest
"long
parol
peop
caref

supervisory parole officers and community employment agencies, public or private.

In a few states parole law or administrative policy still causes officers to inform an employer of the subject's status as an "ex-con" or a "parolee" early in the employment interview rather than *after* discussion of the man's skills or potential value to the specific business. This procedure is indefensible. It requires the parole officer (or the parolee applicant himself) to turn the businessman into a penologist—in a brief visit or phone call. The statement of status is generally followed by the pitiful—and often pitiable—query in the name of "rehabilitation," after which little room, if any, is left for discussion of the applicant's ability to help make a product or perform a service. If the businessman is still listening, he may not even be asked about wages, working conditions, or any of the other details which any worker—offender or otherwise—has a desire and a right to know in advance.

We know employers who regard this approach as unbusinesslike, wasteful. And it must appear to signify an outright lack of faith in our product—both the man and his dignity. Small wonder that many of these employers are upset by the tone of some of the research questionnaires they receive from correctional agencies, who ask, "Does your firm hire ex-convicts (or probationers, or parolees)?" A large percentage ignore such inquiries because they have no way of knowing how their answers will be tallied up or interpreted. Offender-employment questionnaires can produce doubtful "long-range propaganda in behalf of parole" unless practical business people are asked to help word them carefully.

Phony Philanthropy

Every parole officer who includes employment placement as an aid to successful supervision can recall unpleasant experiences in dealing with the business world now and then.

We remember the owner-operator of a large printing firm who considered himself a humanitarian. His voice on the telephone was smooth, friendly, yet forceful: "Do you have a parolee who is looking for work?"

The answer was affirmative, of course, but we also asked Mr. Kindly, "What kind of business are you engaged in? And what specific operation do you have in mind?"

His reply was simply, "Oh, we'll break him in on a rotary press. No, he doesn't need to have any experience whatsoever."

"We appreciate your call very much, Mr. Kindly. Can you please tell us how much this job will pay a beginner?"

The response seemed a bit flat. "Oh, we're just like one big happy family here, sir. You don't know us yet, do you? Why not come and visit us? I would like to show you around, personally!"

Hat, coat, and over we went. The reception room was one of the largest and most impressive we have ever seen. It had an immense mural, one of those management-grasps-the-happy-laborer's-hand beauties with (sure enough!) a medallion on which were inscribed some poorly chosen words of tender affection for the noble man we were about to meet. The carpets grew noticeably deeper the closer we came to Mr. Kindly's office. And then his double door opened wide, so that the splendor of the interior could be grasped in one breathless moment: a thronelike desk, etchings, statuary,

crimson velvet drapes, kitchenette and bar, and the very latest indirect lighting.

We anticipated the contrast in section after section of the manufacturing area. Every piece of equipment, including the rotary presses, seemed more animated and more enthusiastic than the employees. Compared to those in most shops one visits in our business, the men here looked sallow, worn, and insecure. We were not surprised, on returning to our host's office, to have him explain that he never lets an employee's birthday go by without sending for him and shaking his hand personally. This was the year he was giving out engraved pens with the worker's own name on the barrel.

We inquired again about the take-home pay, heard once more about the "big happy family," and were finally given an answer. Mr. Kindly's starting rate was 25 per cent less than the standard minimum for a beginner on a rotary press! Someone must have "sold parole" earlier to this particular boss. We rejected the offer of employment, on behalf of the parolee, and explained why we were doing so. The vituperation came instantly, and later was elaborated in a letter demanding apology for our "insult to a businessman who is trying his best to cooperate and to help with social problems."

Contrast

Some years ago, this writer succeeded in arranging an appointment with the personnel manager of a well-known Eastern railroad, for discussion of the qualifications of two mechanics I represented—one experienced in shop maintenance, the other a maintenance plumber and steamfitter. (Have you ever seen the way pipes are strung out between the rear end of a series of cells and the wing wall?)

Only after a thorough discussion of their skills did he inquire in detail about our service for offenders. He asked many more questions than do most employers and seemed to be testing something other than the facts as they were being presented. At last he stood up, walked over to the door separating his office from that of his secretary, closed it, and returned to say, "If you think your plumber can also learn something about sheet metal work, I want you to send him to see me." And after a moment, he went on: "I like the way you represent your service. You see, I first came to work for this railroad years ago through the Osborne Association. Just see that you don't load me!"

And we didn't "load" him. Nor did we ever tell an applicant thereafter that he would be interviewed by a man who, like himself, had known the meaning of a prison experience.

This unusual situation seems to throw a little confusion into the issue of whether or not it is always necessary to reveal the condition of conviction. And, by the way, has any parole authority ever felt it necessary or had the effrontery to develop a form or questionnaire to determine whether the employer himself has ever been convicted of a crime or has ever had trouble with labor unions, insurance companies, his taxes, his credit, or the local fire department?

Easier, Safer

We know many parole officers all over the United States who have developed their own effective methods for helping clients to connect with job opportunities. Our agency has learned much from observing their techniques.

A private employment service should not create dependency; part of our

respon
crutch,
Now
individu
entirely
vate ag
come a
the ha
most
money
fares, t
The
in the
Male"
July 2
prosper
who w
finding
name
pose h
CI
gra
ex
W
Please
of the
or of
Parole
althou
all thr
clear,
tual la
Jon
clerk
Raifor
he wa
tance
becam
track
in for
purpo
exper
simple
and t
tion.
Not
permi

responsibility involves removing the crutch, although sometimes gradually. Now and then we must help the same individual several times before he is entirely on his own, for naturally private agencies receive and should welcome a high percentage of clients in the hard-to-place category. In fact, most private services try to raise money to help with subsistence, car-fares, tools, etc.

The following ad, which we placed in the classified "Situations Wanted—Male" section of the *New York Times*, July 28, 1959, serves to illustrate how prospects were developed for a man who would have had great difficulty finding his own job at first. (The name "Jones" is fictitious for our purpose here.)

CLERK-TYPIST, Good Stenographer, 24. Expd. Industrial: excellent at figures. Types 70+ WPM. Jones, MU 5-9721.

Please note that no mention is made of the Florida State Prison at Raiford, or of the New York State Division of Parole, or of the Osborne Association, although Jones's background included all three. The ad conveys, however, a clear, businesslike description of actual labor values.

Jones had never been an industrial clerk until after his commitment to Raiford. Under good shop supervision, he was much interested in the importance of his task. He took hold and became an excellent worker, keeping track of materials and goods coming in for production or for all other purposes. He learned to type, and his experience taught him enough about simple bookkeeping to keep inventory and to record the details of distribution.

Note that his last name (with his permission) immediately preceded our

office phone number. Incoming phone calls at the Osborne Association are invariably answered with a simple "Hello." Some might argue that it would be "more proper" to answer with something like "This is the Osborne Association where we help poor, inept, and untrustworthy ex-convicts to rehabilitate themselves," but we disagree.

The first of three responses the day the ad appeared came from an office manager in a national advertising agency. I handled the call by giving my name and offering to take a message for Mr. Jones. The caller asked sensible questions such as the location and description of Mr. Jones's last job. He was told that the location was Florida and that the specifications were as stated in the advertisement. He asked whether the candidate would consider a starting pay of \$75 a week, whereupon we suggested that Mr. Jones could easily call back at 10:30 that morning to discuss further details.

The caller agreed and asked my relationship to the applicant. I then identified the Osborne Association immediately and volunteered a quick description of the agency's purpose. With no hesitation, I explained that Mr. Jones had embezzled funds from a former employer, a haberdasher in Miami. I further explained his conviction and the fact that he had learned his job as industrial clerk during his prison experience, adding that he had been of real service to the state (which he had, according to Florida's own summary).

The caller then heard a brief but clear description of the man's disrupted family, his attitude about himself and his misdeed, the extent of his education, and the fact that he had

grown up in New York City and would be living with relatives here. I stated that his parole officer was an expert in supervision and that this supervision would help Jones become a valuable employee in the shortest possible time. We added that our service has been in business for a long time. The employer asked whether the parole process required anyone except himself to know about the new employee's background. He wanted to know whether parole supervision would interrupt Jones' work or cause any embarrassment whatsoever for the firm or for Jones by mail, phone, or visit; we assured him this would not happen.

Short Circuit

Naturally this case was carefully selected to illustrate how a service like ours sometimes makes a placement; but it was also chosen for another important reason. This referral was "in the bag," so to speak; but it was rejected by our office and by Jones, himself, because during a second phone call to inquire about details of the work, we learned that our clerk would share office space with a senior accountant, one other clerical employee, and the company safe. The accountant not only opened the safe every morning but left it open all day. The amount of money thus exposed could run from a small petty cash account early in the week to several thousand dollars in accumulated receipts by Friday night, when it was customarily deposited. We stated frankly that such a layout might prove unfair, if not unwise, under the circumstances. Oddly enough, the employer said he would like to "take a chance," but finally conceded that we were protecting him, and the conversation ended pleasantly.

Perhaps there would be a less sensitive opening some other time.

The second inquiry on the same ad was quickly determined inappropriate for other reasons. The third proved ideal. The requirements were much the same as in the first opening. The starting pay was again \$75, the work area completely satisfactory; no weakness in methods, systems, or any apparent detail that might expose Jones to temptation if he were to become so inclined.

Thus, a businessman selected an excellent value, an offender feels secure with a normal challenge for the future, and parole obtains a client who is cooperative.

Furthermore, the man who trained Jones at Raiford must feel his task to be deeply important.

Is it not easier and safer this way? We fear and we hear that too many offenders are pushing brooms or working in shops like Mr. Kindly's.

Three Loose Ends

How often we hear that the lack of public understanding is the chief barrier to progress in all branches of correctional work! And we must acknowledge that the public is actually our customer, just as it is the consumer of products from competitive industry. Can we not, then, readily suppose that men and women who emerge from our correctional institutions are actually human products who have been prepared for the labor market? We are told that no business can compete successfully nowadays unless its outlets are conveniently available and ready for the public appetite.

"Conveniently available" should put us in mind of the remote locations of some of our correctional facilities. In contrast to modern industries, which

are also apt to be located in out-of-the-way places for many of the same reasons but nevertheless develop distribution points to bring their goods to those who want them, we have not yet gone far enough to put our eligible inmates near enough to the labor market. Such a large number of them have no homes or families of their own, or "contacts" to help them. We hear and read about the "Bridge House" in California, in Chicago, and in Baltimore, and we watch the operation of all three very keenly. We also sense that the United Kingdom is experimenting with extended week ends more than we do. One of our states is granting leaves to selected inmates to be released from prison without actual job assurance, but stating a specified time for the man to accomplish the details of his parole program or, failing, to return to the institution, perhaps to try again another time. Why can we not think of using some of our jail facilities (where not too overcrowded) as distribution points, or Bridge Houses, in or near appropriate industrial or farm areas? If it is true that our prison facilities are being overpopulated faster than state budgets can provide additional confinement space, why is it not practical to explore state payment of board bills for overdue inmates to be housed for short periods and in limited numbers in jails or lockups nearer to personnel offices, farms, or other employment possibilities? Thus, the "customer" and the job candidate would be close to each other, and one of the

frequent barriers to getting jobs for parolees might be simplified.

The time factor of availability for placement is also a problem. A few parole boards are still laboring the hard way by overlooking the feasibility of letting their inmates try first to be worthy of a "ready for delivery" status. New York identifies this status as an "open date," which means "available and ready to be paroled on receipt of the necessary requirements (approved job, arrival address, etc.)." Businessmen do not worry much about hiring employees until the moment when they need additional help. They can't seem to understand why a decent job offer should be encouraged and offered to an inmate through a parole board, which may thereafter determine whether or not his release is deserved and legally permissible. This practice antagonizes the employer for the future; and this habit by a parole board somehow leads to another error which can be tragic: the offer is made, investigated, and approved, but the board action is so slow that by the time the inmate is released, the job is no longer there.

And finally, the lack of understanding can provide problems with security agencies like the Coast Guard, the Army Security Program, and Navy Intelligence, and also with bonding companies in insurance. Private agencies and state employment services can do much more to help close this gap by supplying facts with the help and approval of correctional administrators.

Jobs for Youngsters

LILA ROSENBLUM

Director of Public Information, National Committee on Employment of Youth

MANUEL was sixteen years old. The chip on his shoulder seemed even older. He lived in a high delinquency area of the East Bronx in New York City, had recently been expelled from school, and was on probation for possession of a weapon. Although his appearance was pleasant and his intelligence average, his chances for a nondelinquent future would have been negligible up until a year or so ago.

Today, however, Manuel is doing well. He's enrolled in a Long Island school and working part-time at a good job. He has become a cooperative and friendly human being.

Manuel owes his happier future to an experimental project in vocational teamwork conducted by Federation Employment and Guidance Service in two high delinquency areas of the East Bronx. The FECS project was the result of a decision by a New York City Youth Board committee (composed of lay and professional leaders) in 1957 to try a new approach toward helping delinquents and potential delinquents.

The Youth Board awarded funds to Federation Employment and Guidance Service for a special project to give vocational adjustment services to youngsters on the premise that "the establishment of constructive habits of work would channel energies frequently misspent in destructive habits of gang activity and delinquent behavior."¹

¹"Report of Special Youth Board Project," Federation Employment and Guidance Service, New York, April, 1958, p. 2.

FECS held group orientation meetings and individual consultations with over forty social agencies in the Bronx with whom the Youth Board had contracts for client referrals. It then opened an office in the area. Staff included three full-time professionals: a group guidance counselor, a psychologist counselor, and a placement counselor.

To promote employer support, FECS staff spoke before local civic clubs, mailed oversized postcards announcing the project to a wide selection of Bronx employers, and sent publicity to newspapers and periodicals. Two employer advisory committees (local and citywide) were set up with recruiting help from the Bronx Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade. Executives from large corporations participated, circulating materials, interesting their business contacts, and sometimes making jobs available in their own firms.

The social agencies and Youth Board units began referring youngsters for psychological, academic aptitude, and interest inventory tests, individual counseling (focused on planning long-range vocational goals, as well as filling immediate job needs), direct job placement, follow-up, and a variety of group services at neighborhood community centers, including occupational films, group discussions on how to look for a job and act on interviews, and lectures on job problems.

Manuel arrived at the FECS office with a pressing need for a full-time job. His probation was scheduled for

review in a short time, and FECS and the Youth Board worker who referred him felt he should be working before then. He reported faithfully for placement every morning, grew less hostile with each visit, and developed a friendly relationship with his counselor. They made tentative plans for his future, and, in a few days, he had a job.

Manuel lost the job because he was absent so much while attending the hearing and taking psychiatric tests. But his work had been satisfactory, and after several phone conversations with his mother and probation officer, FECS helped him make plans for more intensive vocational guidance and further schooling. A second job placement followed, and counseling on adjustment problems and occupational skills needed for advancement has been given him during the evening hours.

Most of the children served by FECS were, like Manuel, "hard-core youngsters from disrupted homes, having a total range of vocational and personal disabilities . . . not all delinquent, the group programs in fact being established as a preventive measure to minimize the development of delinquent behavior at a later date."² Children who might have resented other types of help "accepted vocational services as a means of working through 'normal' problems."³

FECS is generally satisfied its program works. Out of the first 195 teenagers between sixteen and twenty-one served, 135 were referred to jobs, and 59 of them were placed. The majority responded well, and many like Manuel have continued evening counseling after placement.

²*Ibid.*, p. 3.

³*Ibid.*, p. 6.

Imaginative Experiments

The New York City project is one of a handful developed in the past several years by a few imaginative communities to help delinquent or delinquency-prone youth in immediate and practical ways through vocational programs. Most of the projects are still in experimental stages and have not yet been evaluated, but all of their originators are enthusiastic and convinced that they have hit on something that helps.

Last summer, the New York City Mission Society tried a work project to help youngsters that had been in trouble with the police in previous summers. They hired 145 youngsters between fifteen and eighteen years of age for seven weeks. Kids came from heavy delinquency areas. At least half had had police trouble; those who had not were to be a "balancing influence."

Seven went as helpers to camps run by the society. The rest worked in the city—renovating church or community center buildings, doing landscaping, repairing the homes of needy persons, doing clerical work, or helping oversee recreation programs for younger children.

Many of the young workers had never had pocket money. Now they earned ten dollars a week. Many opened their first bank accounts; others gave money to their mothers or bought clothes for the coming school year. Fifteen volunteered money from their salaries to enable the project to take on more youngsters.

Not one participant got into trouble. Not one quit out of dissatisfaction. All displayed fine, eager attitudes toward their jobs. Warren Henry, director of the project, says the experience gave them "a sense of purpose and achievement. . . . They could

see the difference their work made." One of the boys said, "It's nice to feel useful to somebody."

Chances to feel useful are rare for youngsters with court records or anti-social problems. They rarely get an opportunity to feel productive on a job because too many employers automatically turn away at the first sign of a police record.

To counteract repeated no's from employers in Hamilton County, Ohio, juvenile court Judge Benjamin S. Schwartz started a specially geared placement program for young probationers. The program has each probationary jobseeker complete a questionnaire, take an aptitude test, and get a complete physical and psychological examination. The most suitable type of work is determined on the basis of these tests. All the materials are then submitted to a prospective employer, and an initial interview is arranged.

Samuel Englander, the court's referee, reports that the "community has been wonderful in accepting our recommendations. . . . In an overwhelming majority of cases we have achieved success. . . . Of course, we still have the old story . . . more persons to place than we have jobs. . . . However, we feel that each child that makes a successful adjustment in the community is just one more achievement in the purpose and philosophy of the court."

Citizens Volunteer

Another far different type of program seems to be yielding equally positive results in the city of Cincinnati. There, a volunteer citizen's committee is encouraging "problem" teens to complete high school through the supportive financial help that jobs

provide. Nine women's groups have combined to sponsor the Youth Employment Service, a continuous, permanent program of the Citizens' Committee on Youth.

CCY pays all the costs of operation and gives professional supervision. The women's groups canvass the community for job openings and provide volunteers to work a minimum of two hours daily in the YES office, taking phone and mail job orders from employers, keeping records of placements and students referred, and preparing reports. They channel job orders to the school counselor, who refers suitable students.

The youngster has an interview with a volunteer to get facts about job requirements, pay scale, and hours—and a referral card to take to the employer. The volunteer calls the employer to tell him about the student and learn when the interview or the starting day of work will be. Several weeks later, she calls back to get his reaction and to check on the possibility of more openings. Students who aren't hired get special counseling to help them overcome interfering problems employers have mentioned to the volunteers.

In the two years the program has been running, 350 high-delinquency-area teen-agers were placed in part-time jobs, mostly in home services (baby sitting and child care, gardening, house cleaning, ironing, and mothers' helpers) and, during holidays, in department stores and small businesses. Employers have been giving "excellent reports" about the job performances of the youngsters placed. Their willingness "to at least try out the youth" is one of the program's most interesting developments, accord-

ing
recto
Youth
port
"C
jobs
to m
"Mo
this
of a
good
stand
relat
prov
youth
delin
serve

TH
along
is ap
cial s
tiona
reach
thori
evalu
prog
vocat
a tot
that
integ
prog
to c
whic
(emo
tion,

In
coun
give
six g
need
an h

*D.
cation
School
Sacra

ing to Frank Manella, Executive Director of the Citizens' Committee on Youth. "They recognize the full import of what we are trying to do."

"Our objective in finding these jobs is not only the desire for youth to make money," Mr. Manella stresses. "More important is the total effect of this employment in the development of attitudes and values resulting in good work habits and a better understanding of the employer-employee relationship. . . . Although we cannot prove conclusively by research that youth employment is a preventive of delinquency, we feel strongly that it serves this purpose."

Is Work a "Cure"?

There is still no evidence that work alone will "cure" a delinquent, but it is apparent that youngsters with special social problems need special vocational attention. The conclusions reached by the California Youth Authority's Ventura School for Girls in evaluating its vocational counseling program make good sense. It found vocational help "valuable as part of a total treatment program" but urged that it "be accompanied and closely integrated with a general counseling program. . . . It cannot be expected to overcome certain other factors which contribute to failure on parole (emotional conflicts, narcotics addiction, etc.)."⁴

In the Ventura program, group counseling sessions are designed to give each girl regular attention. About six girls, similar in age and vocational needs, participate in a session lasting an hour and held once a week. The

program begins with the girls getting acquainted with one another and their counselor. They complete vocational interest blanks, indicating their reactions to various occupations, school subjects, recreational activities, and hobbies. State employment service staff members visit and give aptitude tests. Later, the girls discuss possible futures in the light of their test results, school progress, and emotional and home problems. After all the problems have been talked about together, plans are made for each girl.

Ventura is responsible for another important job-aid for its delinquents: a trades advisory council, established with the help of local industrial leaders who had expressed interest in contributing to the girls' adjustments in whatever way they could. The council, composed of representatives from industry, labor, business, state employment services, and the school's staff, meets about every three months at the school. Members visit classes, evaluate the timeliness and usefulness of the vocational training, hold individual interviews with the girls, and at business meetings report their reactions (which the counselor later discusses with the girls).

The council's objectives are to help create acceptance of delinquent girls by employers through personal contacts in the working world, promote constructive work habits and attitudes in the girls, create interest in various occupational areas, aid in developing greater emotional stability, provide actual work-experience in school and in the community, and enlist volunteer workers from the community.

It has assisted directly in getting the girls jobs. It presented recommendations on starting an electronics class,

⁴D. J. Ertel, "Preliminary Report of Vocational Counseling Program at the Ventura School for Girls," California Youth Authority, Sacramento, November, 1957, pp. 2, 9.

bringing a needle trades class up-to-date, planning a waitress training class, and generally inspired the girls in parole rehabilitation.

"Vocational needs can't be separated from emotional needs," says Mrs. Barbara DeNoon, vocational counselor at Ventura. Emotional needs "have to be worked out" so that vocational needs can function—"although sometimes vocational planning directly assisted in emotional problems getting better or clearing up."

If vocational help represents even a partial solution in the rehabilitation of some delinquents, as these programs seem to demonstrate, it is worth trying! The best statistical evidence seems to show that juvenile delinquency has been rising in recent years.

The increase in court cases and police arrests of children is much greater than can be accounted for by population increases; and the cost, very high.

Even without scientific evidence that jobs prevent or "cure" delinquency, it is possible to agree with a Ventura parole officer who said that vocational efforts for delinquent youngsters have "an important place . . . a real value. . . . While some of them have such deep-seated problems that they are unable to use the help immediately, it is not necessarily lost and does help them in securing a job when they are more stabilized. With some youngsters a job is an important stabilizing influence and is the first step in producing a change in attitude and behavior."⁵

⁵ *Ibid.*, exhibit III d.

TH
ning
dence
by A
attorn
most
fende
to his
the U
crimi
figure
Repo
Burea
Th
perso
prose
offere
Appr
mate
tence
is wid
ably
first
avera
thirty
a tota
with
lion
crime
that
affect
times
exerci
not m
juven
We
baum

Public Employment of Persons with a Criminal Record

RANDOLPH E. WISE

Commissioner, Department of Public Welfare, Philadelphia

THE number of persons with a criminal record is enormous, running into the millions. The main evidence for this was brought together by Aaron Nussbaum, assistant district attorney in New York County, in a most challenging pamphlet, "First Offenders—A Second Chance." According to his analysis, fifty million persons in the United States have a record of criminal conviction. This astounding figure is based on the Uniform Crime Reports published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The data show that over 6,500,000 persons were arrested and held for prosecution in 1953. (The figure is offered as typical for any recent year.) Approximately 4,500,000, it is estimated, were found guilty and sentenced. If the recidivist rate is—as it is widely assumed—63 per cent (probably an overestimate), 1,600,000 were first offenders. Using the figure as an average for any year, each period of thirty years (a generation) produces a total of almost fifty million persons with a criminal record, over ten million of them convicted of major crimes. Nor should it be overlooked that an arrest without a conviction, affecting many more persons, sometimes has a serious effect on a person's exercise of civil rights. And we have not mentioned those with a record of juvenile delinquency.

We can find no error in Mr. Nussbaum's computation. Perhaps the un-

derlying FBI data are enlarged somewhat. But even if we lop off some millions, the number of persons with a criminal record still would reach tens of millions. Here, then, is a problem affecting a truly substantial segment of our population.

This large group constitutes a serious social problem because the persons in it are subjected to discriminatory treatment. The discrimination is exercised largely by private groups and individuals—employers, landlords, informal and formal social groups. But dealing with persons with a criminal record is also a problem confronting government. One particular aspect of the problem is employment of persons with a record. Because their number is so large it seems self-defeating and contradictory, and certainly neither practical nor conscionable, for public departments to discriminate arbitrarily against these persons and bar them from employment on the basis of their criminal record.

A Survey of Practice

To obtain information on the practice in public employment of persons with a criminal record, the NPPA, in cooperation with the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada (now the Public Personnel Association) conducted a survey by questionnaire. Replies were received from eighty-one jurisdictions—twenty-six state departments, two Canadian

provinces, nine counties, thirty-seven American and three Canadian cities, and four utility districts (three in the U.S. and one in Canada). Because of my interest in a policy for my own department, I undertook to compile the results of the survey.

The information received reveals a considerable range of differences in policy. A number of departments automatically deny employment to persons with a record. The number of departments having a contrary policy, liberal although selective, is large enough to demonstrate that it is feasible and desirable.

1. The first question asked was: "During the past five years has your jurisdiction actually employed any persons who had previously been convicted of legal offenses (other than minor traffic violations)?"

Of the eighty-one jurisdictions, fifty-eight answered "yes," twelve answered "no," seven answered they had no record of such employment, and four did not answer the question.

2. The next question was: "Do you have a written policy regarding the employment of former offenders?"

Twenty-eight answered "yes"; fifty-two answered "no"; one did not answer the question. Of those answering "yes," one answered that a formal policy was required by the state constitution, five stated that it was required by statute, twenty-two stated that it was required by administrative rules; two answered that it was required by both statute and administrative rule.

Fifteen jurisdictions having written policies have discretionary powers to reject certain types of offenders; in thirteen jurisdictions the rejection of certain types is mandatory and the exclusion of others is discretionary.

The jurisdictions whose written policies list specific grounds for rejection report conviction of the following as reasons for exclusion: crime involving moral turpitude (nine), infamous crime (five), crime (five), felony (four), habitual drunkenness (eight), drug addiction (eight), notoriously disgraceful conduct (six). Eight jurisdictions list various other specific grounds.

The Public Service Commission of Saskatchewan has a regulation that "every effort shall be made to provide an opportunity for convicted persons to rehabilitate themselves when they have been released from jail."

3. Jurisdictions having discretionary powers which permit them to take into account the nature of the job and the nature of the offense were asked to indicate (a) positions for which offenders are never hired, (b) positions for which certain kinds of offenses are disqualifying, (c) offenses which bar offenders from positions of any kind, and (d) whether there is a barrier to the employment of persons who have a record of arrest but not conviction.

(a) Under positions for which offenders are never hired, police or sheriff were listed by twenty-seven jurisdictions, fireman by fourteen, and prison guard by six; many other positions were listed in lower frequencies.

(b) Under positions for which certain kinds of offenses are disqualifying, police were listed twelve times, fireman nine times, positions of trust and responsibility eight times, recreation worker five times, and hospital attendant three times.

(c) Under offenses which bar offenders from positions of any kind, sex offenses were listed eight times, felonies six times, crimes involving moral turpitude four times, and habitual drunkenness three times.

(d) Forty-three jurisdictions replied that they had no barrier to the employment of persons who have a record of arrest but not of conviction. Twelve qualified their answers; for example: "The barrier exists if the arrests were the result of notoriously disgraceful conduct, or if the applicants attempt to conceal information about the arrest." "We inquire as to reason for arrest and then determine action." "Each case is carefully reviewed on the basis of circumstances, nature of offense, recency, and many other factors." "A long record of arrests without convictions is considered in character evaluation." "Evidence might be strong for conviction, but person might come clear because of legal technicality or maneuvering."

Respondents to this question were asked to specify whether any distinction is made between felons and misdemeanants, and as to persons who had received suspended sentence or probation and persons who have served a term in prison. However, this request for more specific information was almost universally disregarded.

4. The next question was: "If a former offender appears on an eligible list and is reached for certification, what kind of information is furnished to the appointing authority?"

Forty-three jurisdictions furnish all available information to the appointing authority. Four furnish such information upon request. Nine furnish the information listed by the applicant on his application. Fourteen furnish full information on records of arrests and convictions. Four jurisdictions do not furnish any information.

5. Respondents were then asked to summarize the attitude of their appointing authorities on the hiring of convicted offenders.

Twenty-three said that most appointing authorities are willing to consider convicted offenders and described their attitude as very good, good, or favorable. Eight said the attitude differs from agency to agency. Four said that appointing authorities are open-minded if the candidate's record shows sincere effort toward rehabilitation. Six said the attitude depends on the merits of the individual case. One said the attitude depends on the function of the agency and the public interest in it. Sixteen said their appointing authorities usually do not desire to consider the employment of convicted offenders and described their attitude as poor or reluctant. "In our small jurisdiction appointing authorities have not found it necessary to hire convicted operators in order to keep an adequate staff." Three others described attitudes variously as "Excellent," "Generous," and "Very reluctant, cagey, and cautious."

The civil service personnel director of a large and populous state wrote: "Since we deal with 2,000 appointing authorities, we cannot summarize their attitudes on hiring into one category. A small number of appointing authorities do not want any convicted offender even where the crime was a minor one for which little or no penalty was imposed. A large number object if the crime was a serious one. Many leave the matter entirely to civil service."

6. The next question was: "In your estimation, what are the greatest barriers to actual employment of former offenders in your jurisdiction—for example: flat legal prohibitions, administrative rules and policies, attitudes of department heads, attitudes of employees?"

Twenty-eight respondents mentioned the attitude of department heads and

nineteen mentioned public opinion as the principal barrier to the employment of offenders. (Several mentioned the fact that it is the appointing authority which gets the blame if something goes wrong.) One mentioned the condition of public trust that is characteristic of many public service jobs. Fifteen named both a legal prohibition and administrative policies as the greatest barriers. Two blamed their own inability to make an adequate investigation of the merits of each case. Two said that most former offenders lack adequate skill which would make them employable at the technical level. One said objections are raised in many cases because the applicant attempts to conceal his record and is thus guilty of making a false statement. One mentioned insurance requirements (bonding) as a serious obstacle. The lack of a fair appraisal of job standards and the lack of a positive policy were mentioned by others. Eleven jurisdictions said no real barriers exist and one of them added that a written policy would greatly hamper their efforts to make a decision on an individual case on its merits.

7. Finally the respondents were asked to state their personal views on the employment of offenders.

Fifty-two favored treating each case on its own merits. Twenty-seven jurisdictions expressed themselves in one form or another in favor of carefully reviewing each case and matching the candidate with the job. Twenty-three emphasized that government must share with private employers the responsibility for the rehabilitation of offenders. Twelve respondents expressed their fear of adverse public reaction. Said one: "The prestige of public service is low enough without

the added burden of ex-convicts regardless of how deserving they may be."

Typical comments were as follows: "They should be given every opportunity for appointment to any position where they would not be a liability to the department." "They have paid for their offenses; we are not here to sentence them further, but neither should we encourage their employment in areas offering temptations of the type they have shown themselves unable to resist." "Conviction of a criminal offense is a danger signal, not a stop sign. If the offender has shown sincere effort to rehabilitate himself, he deserves help and should be considered for employment, if he otherwise qualifies."

Several jurisdictions attempted to describe, in detail, positive policies designed to aid the employment of offenders and their readjustment to a job:

One jurisdiction recommended periodical counseling to assist them in resolving personal problems.

Another jurisdiction suggested: "A positive policy might well include (1) deliberately setting aside a specific percentage or number of vacancies to be filled each year with rehabilitation cases; (2) modifying procedures, hours, and conditions of employment, etc., as necessary to aid in solving the problem. The latter change should include waiving the rule of three in certifying eligibles so that applicants in this category can be reached so long as they rate above a certain reasonably high point on the list."

One Canadian province wrote: "Offenders should be handled by a special placement team which will (1) work under the auspices of an organized public correctional or rehabilitation

progr
habili
depa
tive e
civil
basis v
cedur
certifi
qualif
large
rehab
an ed
with r

The
individu
by th
of the
ments
do not
and h
tion o
parol
other
terest
the s
versel
fende
each
sider
the p
ment
polic
point
tion
boys'
offen
or b
posit

program; (2) study the case from a rehabilitation angle and inform the department head who is the prospective employer; (3) establish with the civil service commission a working basis whereby normal competitive procedures are waived in these cases and certification is made on a minimum qualification basis; and, (4) assume a large share of the responsibility for rehabilitation 'failures' and conduct an education and publicity program with the general public."

The majority viewpoint favoring individualization was best expressed by the administrative director of one of the large state civil service departments, who wrote: "The state should do no less than it asks private industry and business to do in the rehabilitation of convicted offenders through its parole and probation divisions and its other agencies. Where the public interest and the proper carrying out of the state's business will not be adversely affected, I believe former offenders should be employed. However, each offender's record must be considered in the light of the duties of the position to which he seeks appointment. For example, it would be poor policy and bad administration to appoint a convicted embezzler to a position of cashier, a sexual pervert to a boys' or girls' reform school, or an offender who had a record of violent or brutal crimes against persons to a position involving the care of the ill

or mentally deficient. The nature, pattern, and recency of the crime, as well as the age of the offender at the time, the circumstances leading up to commission of the crime, and the offender's rehabilitation should all be taken into account since all have an important part in determining his employability by a government agency."

A Policy for Government

That regular employment is a basis for successful living for the former offender, just as it is for the person who has never violated the law, is axiomatic, and is so recognized by government in its specific efforts to help the offender in his working career. To some extent they are effective but they are also being undercut by half-heartedness and cross-purposes.

In recent years particularly, statutes have come into existence protecting individuals from discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or age. We know of no statute prohibiting discrimination against persons with criminal records, and probably such a law would face a variety of difficulties. But it would have a sound basis in social need.

The state as employer should, out of economic self-interest at least, be a model of employment policy. From the findings of the survey, a minimum policy for public departments would be to bar no person from employment automatically because of his criminal record.

Annual Reports

ARMINÉ DIKIJIAN

Librarian, National Probation and Parole Association

READING 182 reports consecutively, one seems to hear a great chorus begin, much like a community sing, with the little ball bouncing on the screen over the words: "Needed—smaller caseloads, bigger staff, better facilities." The ensemble's members are hearty and dedicated but their song is sorrowful, with only an occasional bright passage. (Surely the saddest voice belongs to the New Mexico Youth Commission whose annual appropriation was cut to \$1.)

The California Bureau of Criminal Statistics (with a chief long articulate on the measuring of crime) might be considered a spokesman for the many agencies whose reports are largely or completely statistical. In a clear-cut exposition of the difficulties it encounters, the Bureau says (in *Crime in California*) of juvenile arrests:

For adults the reason must be stated in terms of the violation of a specific criminal law. Under the Juvenile Court Act, juveniles may be charged with such things as incorrigibility, running away, and disobedience, which are not violations of the criminal law but which are conditions stated in the Juvenile Court Act for which a court petition can be filed in connection with a child. With such a loose description of behavior, juveniles can be picked up and referred for action by the juvenile court or even taken under control of the police department for almost any type of behavior that anyone cares to allege.

In *Delinquency and Probation in California*, another of its reports, the Bureau pursues the subject from the standpoint of "the diverse philosophies of probation departments."

The Research Division of the Pennsylvania Bureau of Correction compares case-record methods and tally-sheet methods for computing judicial criminal statistics and enlarges on the problem of the "unit of count." Of the latter the Ohio Bureau of Research and Statistics notes in its *Judicial Criminal Statistics* report:

The unit of count is the defendant. Frequently the term "case" is used synonymously with "defendant." When a defendant is proceeded against on more than one offense and they are disposed of at the same or nearly the same time, he is counted on the offense going the farthest in court proceedings. If more than one offense charged against the defendant reaches the same stage of court proceedings, he is counted on the offense carrying the greatest maximum penalty.

Thus duplication in tabulating dispositions may be reduced but cannot be entirely eliminated.

The 1958 volume of the FBI *Uniform Crime Reports*—perhaps the most frequently quoted source of statistics in the country—was the first to be issued in accordance with the recommendations of the Bureau's Consultant Committee. Since 1959 was to be the first full year of operation under the new procedure, not all of the recommendations could be implemented. Effective immediately were the following:

The lessening of the emphasis on the differentiation between the Part I and Part II offenses; the use of a somewhat revised grouping of offenses known to the police as an index of the extent of the trends in criminality; the discontinuance

of decennial census figures as the basis of computation of rates, except for the census years, and use instead of annual population estimates by the Bureau of the Census, current data provided by various State and local governmental agencies, and private population estimates; and the adoption of the differentiation into standard metropolitan areas instead of the former distinction between rural and urban population.

In future reports, to be issued annually and not semiannually as heretofore, the FBI will implement the recommendations which involve long-range planning:

Briefly, Recommendations 5, 6, and 21 involve the proposal that efforts be made to enlarge the coverage of statistics on persons arrested to include both urban and rural areas—by a sampling technique if need be—to the end that (1) the data on age, sex, and race of persons arrested might be available for the entire criminal population, and (2) that eventually the total crime picture of the United States might cover all types of offenses including those reported only through the media of arrest reports.

Recommendations that there be discussions "to reconsider the offenses which should be handled as 'offenses known' and which should be reported on the basis of the arrest of the offenders, as well as to determine the group of offenses especially important to the police in its work," were placed on the agenda of the 1959 meeting with the Committee on Uniform Crime Records of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Apropos of population, several agencies have suggested that every annual report carry a statement of the total population in the area which the agency serves (state, city, or county). Without such a statement, comparisons of reports as to rates of crime and delinquency, volume of work,

caseloads, staff, and other points are not really valid.

Domestic Relations

An outstanding new feature of the reports examined was emphasis on family and marriage counseling in court and institutional settings. The Chatham County (Savannah, Ga.) Family Court put it this way:

We have made rather solid gains in combating the breakdown in family life which is so evident in divorce petitions and case histories of delinquency and neglect. One marriage counselor in just a few months during 1958 effected a number of reconciliations which resulted in almost 100 children escaping the impoverishment of a broken and defeated home.

The Juvenile Welfare Board of Pinellas County (St. Petersburg, Fla.) reported a 44 per cent score of success in a study of 400 cases. The marriage counselor attached to the Correction Department of Franklin County (Chambersburg, Pa.) saw 109 families in six months. "Only in one case did a separation take place after the marriage counselor had been consulted."

Caseload standards are not applicable to family services, cautions the Probation Department of the Baltimore City Supreme Bench. "The problem there involves classification of cases for assignment and establishment of caseloads of various sizes, depending on the classification."

In counseling convicted felons and their families, the Kentucky Division of Probation and Parole begins the parole process before actual incarceration. "It is believed that such a technique has improved the morale of inmates contemplating parole and provides field officers with a better foundation for both their investigations and their supervising efforts."

The California Department of Corrections instituted a family counseling program "which sees the inmate's family as a major factor in successful adjustment." New York City's Department of Correction considered a possible program for counseling families of men incarcerated on Riker's Island. (Echoing throughout its enormous report was the plea for its own primary problem to be solved: the realignment of administrative, correctional, and fiscal policies of the state and the city.)

"Excessive drinking is generally a common denominator in the midst of a variety of causative factors," says the Essex County (Newark, N. J.) Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, about marriage difficulties. The Probation Department of Lehigh County (Allentown, Pa.) backs it up by including news of a recent study of 7,000 case histories of marriage failures. Dr. John L. Thomas, of St. Louis University, who made the analysis, found excessive drinking to be the chief cause in almost 30 per cent of the cases and unfaithfulness in 24.8 per cent.

The Domestic Relations Division of the Baltimore Supreme Bench refers to quite another kind of study—one of 420 men imprisoned for domestic relations offenses—made by the State Department of Correction. "It presents a picture which contrasts strikingly with the naively erroneous but quite prevalent view of the 'domestic relations offender' as essentially a social conformist whose only lapses are in the realm of 'family trouble.'" The "social irresponsibility" of the men, finally imprisoned for domestic relations offenses, is indicated by the fact that 34.1 per cent had been previously imprisoned for crimes other than domestic rela-

tions offenses, 11.7 per cent had been previously convicted of other crimes (fined or given probation), and 27.1 per cent had prior records for *both* domestic relations offenses and other crimes. Altogether, 85.7 per cent had a record of some kind. Only 14.3 per cent had no record at all. "It must be concluded regretfully," the Division says in a prelude to discussion of this study, "that counseling, mediation and intensive probation casework all fail in a great many instances."

Innovations

Though a reader shares satisfaction in the news of a new institution, a sizable addition of staff, and other tangible evidences of progress, lack of space precludes their mention here. A new agency saw the light of day—the Ramsey County (St. Paul, Minn.) Detention and Corrections Authority, "unique in the sense that it is the first attempt in Minnesota at combining such facilities administratively with both units of government [city and county] cooperating in the undertaking."

Under more localized new procedures one finds in *Probation Progress* (California Youth Authority) that the Ventura County Probation Department assigned a deputy probation officer to full-time service to the schools, to work with school officials, students, and parents on attendance and serious behavior problems, to serve in a liaison capacity between schools and the probation department, and to supervise selected students returned to school under informal supervision as wards of the juvenile court or from institutional and other placements. "A dramatic decrease in the filing of juvenile court petitions for school problems" has resulted. The Depart-

ment
the s
pose
norm
cases
An
as "
soon
Boar
He h
part
appe
to h
has
made
parol
peop
assign
danc
cente
this
likeli
need
violat
Ma
notin
City,
class
with
eratin
Priso
thera
dicts.
Prob
the g
in its
tion
the
their
proce
Th
tion
of the
Ohio
court
only
nary
by co

ment has a written agreement with the school system that they will dispose of ordinary problems through normal channels and refer only serious cases.

An ex-parolee, likely to be regarded as "the horse's mouth" by inmates soon to be released, serves the Hawaii Board of Parole in its new experiment. He holds discussions with inmates as part of the preparole program. "It appears that inmates are more likely to heed the words of a person who has 'gone through the mill' and has made good, than institutional or parole staff members or civic-minded people. . . ." The Board has also been assigning parole officers to visit bars, dance halls, and other entertainment centers at night. "It is expected that this activity will help reduce the likelihood of lawbreaking and the need to return to prison for parole violations."

Many other innovations are worth noting. The Jackson County (Kansas City, Mo.) Juvenile Court instituted classes for the parents of delinquents, with the Board of Education cooperating. The Connecticut Farm and Prison for Women began group therapy treatments for narcotic addicts. The San Mateo County (Calif.) Probation Department reported on the group therapy program initiated in its Juvenile Hall—rare in a detention setting; due credit was given to the staff who voluntarily gave up their own time "to continue the process."

The Glueck Delinquency Prediction Tables were the chief concern of the Muskingum County (Zanesville, Ohio) Juvenile Court report. The court began their use in 1956 (the only court to do so) with a preliminary survey to determine their validity by comparing the predicted results in

fifty cases with the actual results over a period of three years. The court points out that the sampling is too small to justify any conclusive findings:

It is hoped that eventually the study may be broadened to include 1,000 cases, which would give a truer picture of both the functioning of the court and the validity of the tables. In the meantime, the court is encouraged to continue the use of the tables as an aid in reaching the proper decision in each case. It should, of course, be understood that the use of such tables is in addition to, and not a substitute for, the various tools that are provided to the court.

The United States Board of Parole inaugurated the practice of having the prisoner's own institutional caseworker sit in on the hearing, to clarify the Board's work and make it more effective, and for morale. "Also, when parole is denied, the caseworker may help interpret to the prisoner what further accomplishments the Board expects of him before parole may be granted."

The New York State Division of Parole describes the projected "Central Index of Criminal Data" to be maintained by the Bureau of Special Services created in 1958. The index will contain "information on individuals known or suspected of being connected with organized crime, confidential information on sensitive cases, correlation of existing files, and possibly a parolee residence file, alias file, and m.o. file of the parolees under supervision."

A good case for a central juvenile index is made by the Wisconsin Division for Children and Youth in its *Juvenile Law Enforcement Report*. A central county listing of juveniles' contacts with the various law-enforcement jurisdictions in the county "can reveal that a juvenile who appears to

be a first time offender is in fact a chronic problem in a number of other jurisdictions within the county. Because of the fact that many juvenile offenders have committed offenses in more than one jurisdiction, this index is of value in determining the course of action to be taken by the apprehending officer and subsequently by the juvenile court."

"Halfway houses" for ex-prisoners and probationers, frequently the subject of library inquiries, are scarcely mentioned. The Commissioner of Alcoholism in Massachusetts suggests such an institution "as an inexpensive approach to successful rehabilitation of chronic drunkenness offenders." The Missouri Board of Probation and Parole tells of a new halfway house in St. Louis.

New Projects

The Ramsey County (St. Paul, Minn.) Probation Department described a psychiatric demonstration project for the St. Paul Municipal Court, financed by a foundation grant. "Its demonstration of real work in the study and treatment of the serious misdemeanant helped the Municipal Court judges to persuade the Legislature to enact provision of permanent services."

The U.S. Board of Parole made the first of a series of reports on its "study of committed youth offenders," providing a background in these words:

At the time the Federal Youth Corrections Act was implemented in October, 1953, the Youth Correction Division of the Board of Parole began preparations for a study to determine the effectiveness of its operations under the Act. It was decided that an intensive study should be made of the persons received from the courts who entered an institution during

the first full year of operation under the Act. Accordingly, the 323 committed youth offenders received during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, were selected as the study group.

The Study consists of four major parts. Part One deals with the offenders themselves; Part Two deals with the institutional phase of their treatment and training; Part Three will deal with the parole phase of the group; and Part Four will consist of pertinent correlations between the various factors which are tabulated.

This was followed by detailed discussion of what each part of the study would seek to learn, and the news that subsequent annual reports would carry the remaining parts of the study.

Two final reports on ongoing projects were mentioned as due this year. The NPPA Michigan Council on Crime and Delinquency is sponsor of the Saginaw Project described in the Michigan Corrections Commission report. "The Probation Department has found evidence that careful investigation to determine probation selection, followed by intensified and personalized supervision, greatly increases the success probability of a probation program." The New York State Division of Parole announced in *Facts and Figures* that its experiment in the intensive supervision of parolees having a history of narcotic addiction would reach the final report stage shortly.

Smile Break

As originator of the "smile break" in serious committee meetings, reports, and articles, I might mention here some of the amusing items encountered in the reading: The listing of such offenses as "gross cheat," "hypothecation," "yoking," "stubbornness," "revelling." A forgery charge against a twelve-year-old—he seems hardly old enough to form his own signature,

let al
and b
—sure
a succ
the M
tion's
turned
been a

A g
statist
see th
of not
by cou
race."
justifi
care, b
selves?

C
Tho
ranks
and de
of age
crease
Bureau
reports
1957 i
Juveni
been a
in traf
Cuyah
Juveni
Divisio
Service
crease
violati
girls' r

"Pro
boys h
ords,"
ington
"But p
boys v
lems i
been 1
center
Run
fense f

let alone copy another's. "Assault and battery with intent to disfigure"—surely a woman's retaliation against a successful rival. A "lye-thrower" in the Maryland Department of Correction's twenty-five categories of assault turned out in a later table to have been a woman.

A good case can be made for most statistical tables. But it is difficult to see the value of a table of "victims of not justifiable homicides reported by county coroners, by death, sex and race." What about the victims of justifiable homicide—or does no one care, because they brought it on themselves?

Girls, Boys, and Wheels

Though the female traditionally ranks far below the male in crime and delinquency generally, a number of agencies noted a considerable increase in offenses by girls. The Ohio Bureau of Research and Statistics reported a 90 per cent increase over 1957 in auto thefts by girls (*Ohio Juvenile Court Statistics*). "There has been a steady rise in girls involved in traffic violations," according to the Cuyahoga County (Cleveland, Ohio) Juvenile Court. Washington State's Division of Children and Youth Services figured a 20.6 per cent increase in referrals of girls for traffic violations, and a total increase in girls' referrals of 8.2 per cent.

"Proportionately fewer girls than boys had previous juvenile court records," the Division notes in its *Washington State Juvenile Court Statistics*. "But proportionately more girls than boys were having attendance problems in schools . . . and would have been referred to a state diagnostic center if one were available."

Running away was the greatest offense for girls (about 25 per cent),

according to the statewide reports of the Florida Department of Public Welfare and the Illinois Youth Commission. (The latter also remarked on an interesting proclivity of girls in the training school: "Fire fighting is a particularly important responsibility . . . with the girls frequently setting fire to their rooms.")

Traffic violations generally shot up. Sixty-six thousand traffic citations were received and handled by the Los Angeles County Probation Department, in addition to the tremendous volume of other departmental work. Kalamazoo County (Kalamazoo, Mich.) found juvenile traffic violations 48 per cent greater than in the previous year, while the Utah Bureau of Services for Children, in its director's juvenile court report, pointed out traffic cases as constituting "over 50 per cent of the total delinquency."

The Riverside County (Riverside, Calif.) Probation Department assigns (as do some other agencies) a juvenile court referee to hear traffic cases. "Inadequate mufflers" topped the list of mechanical violations (30 per cent), and speed (48 per cent) was the most frequent moving violation. The Washington chapter of the American Society of Safety Engineers cooperated with the Arlington County (Arlington, Va.) Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court in the establishment of a traffic safety school for juvenile offenders.

An alert legislature received recognition from the California Youth Authority (*Probation Progress*):

The generally accepted but frequently challenged concept that criminal court proceedings are incompatible with the rehabilitative purpose of the juvenile court was again supported by the Legislature. A bill which would have removed all mis-

demeanor moving violations of the Vehicle Code from the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and placed them in the adult court failed to pass. Similar bills have repeatedly been defeated in preceding sessions.

Employment of Offenders

The collective groans ascending to heaven must surely come from the throats of probation and parole officers charged with finding employment for their clients. The Florida Parole Commission, perhaps somewhat luckier than most, included, in its letter of transmittal, "thanks to the employers of Florida who have recognized that effecting changes in the attitudes of persons convicted of crimes is more than an institutional question, and that unless the man or woman is given the opportunity to work, they will then lose that most valuable element of human life—dignity."

The Indiana Division of Parole put its finger on an important facet of the problem:

The cost of establishing shops for skilled trades and staffing them with adequate instructors is extremely high, so that institutional training programs sometimes lag behind the skills on demand in the open labor market.

One-third of the nation is on the move, remarked the Pennsylvania Board of Parole. "So also are those who pursue criminal activities. This factor presents many new problems in processing eligible parole applicants and in obtaining employment, housing and community acceptance for them, if paroled."

The Bureau of Research and Statistics of the New York parole division made a survey on the question, "Is the inmate required to have a bona fide offer of employment before release from the institution on parole?"

(For a detailed description of the results see the article by L. Stanley Clevenger and John M. Stanton, pp. 159-169 above.)

Appointment of one parole agent as a placement officer may be a partial answer to the problem. The Minnesota Board of Parole and Probation reported great success in this procedure, with most parolees released within two weeks after the granting of parole. Parole successes were noticeably higher, too. The very considerable volume of earnings of all employable parolees is now being publicized annually by the New Jersey Bureau of Parole and is certain to impress the citizenry.

Knotty problems commonly experienced in finding employment for juvenile parolees were pointed up in the Indiana Parole Division's analysis:

The age level for a person on juvenile parole would be considerably higher than that of a child being placed on probation by the court, and therefore greater consideration must be given to the labor market as a potential part of the parole program. A parole program for the juvenile who is no longer in school must contain employment as a necessary ingredient. The Child Labor Laws in Indiana need revitalization by the Legislature in order that opportunity can be provided for youths over the age of 16 years.

The report added that archaic regulations and laws unchanged since 1921 forbid employment by jeopardizing the insurance contracts which the employer holds.

Work Furlough Program

Three California counties pioneered in the Work Furlough Plan (fathered by the Wisconsin Huber Law) which the 1957 legislature enacted. The plan has had excellent results, declares the California Youth

Authority (*Probation Progress*), but "the amount of time each work furlough case requires is measurably more than the amount required by the average adult probationer."

Frequent modifications of working arrangements, disposition of the prisoner's earnings, counseling with the prisoner, his family, and other interested agencies, have led to an estimate that fifteen is the total caseload which a deputy can effectively handle.

Marin County's Probation Department (San Rafael) agrees in its description of its own first year of operation. Forty offenders participated (thirty-three as a condition of their probation). Only three failed, and one was rearrested for a new offense. The prisoners gave 41 per cent of their earnings to their families and dependents in lieu of the public assistance the latter would otherwise have needed. From the remainder, the prisoners paid fines, made restitution to their victims, and partly reimbursed the community.

"Besides its rehabilitative value," comments the California Department of Corrections, "there is a saving of \$1,000 per year per inmate cost." Lack of employment opportunities is generally agreed upon as the chief obstacle and the assignment of a full-time officer as the best procedure for surmounting it.

Special Problems

"Potluck placements" is how the Connecticut Juvenile Court characterizes many foster care programs, in calling for two or more small receiving homes to be used as "transient living situations." The Delaware Youth Services Commission feels that with its own funds (subject to the approval of the state's licensing agency, the Department of Public Welfare)

and its own services for finding foster homes for children ready for release from training schools but lacking homes to return to, a major problem would be solved, "to say nothing of the advantages of getting these children back into the community into satisfactory homes where their continued progress would be encouraged . . . and where, of course, the costs of their care, as compared with the costs of institutional care, would be reduced considerably. This need points up how fine the line is at times between delinquency and dependency."

Concern for a foster-care program for hard-to-place children with a serious emotional disturbance is expressed by the Louisiana Department of Public Welfare and the San Mateo (Redwood City, Calif.) Probation Department, as well as by many other agencies.

The Juvenile Welfare Board of Pinellas County (St. Petersburg, Fla.) found that because the legislature failed to remove the \$81 limit on the total amount to a family receiving ADC, homes were broken up and children had to be placed in foster care. In addition, the legislature enacted a definition of a suitable home "which will probably have the net effect of increasing the placement of children in foster care."

How recent would a reader judge to be a law providing that "children unable to give bail may be committed to the care of a probation officer or kept in some suitable institution outside the enclosure of the jail or police station"? The date is 1907 and the state New Hampshire (as quoted by its Department of Probation). Yet, fifty years and hundreds of thousands of children later, one reads in report

after report of the detention of children in jails and lockups.

Mentally retarded children who should be committed to an institution for the mentally retarded are too often committed as delinquents. The Kentucky Welfare Department and the Marion County (Indianapolis, Ind.) Juvenile Court enlarge on this subject. The New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies has found a way to reduce parole officers' caseloads—by leaving the responsibility for supervising mentally retarded persons to field services in the Bureau of Mental Deficiency.

The Domestic Relations Division of the Baltimore City Supreme Bench discusses "the patchwork of laws relating to bastardy"; it reveals "how illegitimate children become beneficiaries of public assistance through loopholes for the putative fathers." The Long Lane training school for girls, in Connecticut, notes "the marked increase in admission of young unmarried mothers and the impact this has had on the total program. A large amount of social service time has had to be diverted to planning for the girl and her baby." Similar problems involved in services with and for unmarried mothers are often mentioned in other agency reports. (One of them urged "the elimination of repeated births.")

Accolades

Citizen participation in correction might head the list of accolades. Take, for example, the Family Court Association of the New Castle County (Wilmington, Del.) Family Court. This group of citizens not only "works in the community in extending the growth, efficiency and efforts of the Family Court program," but also underwrote the biennial report. (Simi-

lar assistance could well provide a solution for many agencies which badly need the public relations inherent in a published annual report but are unable to afford more than a few typewritten carbon copies—the plaint most often made to the writer as librarian.)

The District of Columbia Juvenile Court appears fortunate in its Advisory Committee of fifteen members, who meet monthly. They made studies and reported to the judge on the protection of children's rights, the development and expansion of the Child Guidance Clinic, and procedures for handling nonsupport cases. The Multnomah County (Portland, Ore.) Juvenile Court and other agencies acknowledge help given and recommendations made by their citizens' committees.

"Without the staff putting in many extra hours, this program would not have been possible." Though overtime is far from new, administrators have only recently begun to acknowledge it in reports. "Most officer personnel are obliged to work in the vicinity of sixty hours weekly in order to discharge their responsibilities," notes the Maine Probation and Parole Board. Oregon's Board records a similar situation.

According to the Pennsylvania Board of Parole, a recent time study showed that "only fourteen minutes per month are spent with the parolee, and even to accomplish this the average agent must work the equivalent of one day per week in overtime."

Public services by inmates receive due acknowledgment. The Maryland Department of Correction mentions prisoner participation at Maryland Penitentiary in studies of vitamin B-12 and of the common cold, made by Johns Hopkins University, and of

deng
versit
cold
of Co
bloo

"It
states
and
mum
of se
enda
trem
have
M. I
pital

TH
sent
Mich
Corr
houn
Corp
Corr
unde

"A
idea
nal
Hol
cussi
ries
thes
the
ente
symp
vast
tion

I
out
New
deat
high
and
that
keep
one
and
role
miss

dengue fever, conducted by the University of Maryland. For the common cold experiment, inmates of the House of Correction supplied 1,500 pints of blood.

"It is the policy of the Board," states the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles, "to recommend a maximum of one thirty-day commutation of sentence per inmate for each calendar year (except in case of an extreme emergency) to inmates who have donated blood to the John Sealy, M. D. Anderson, and state t.b. hospitals."

The United States Air Force presented an award to inmates at a Michigan prison camp, relates the Corrections Commission, for 50,000 hours of duty in the Ground Observer Corps. The Kentucky Division of Correction lists GOC participation under "social activities."

"A man's mind, stretched by an idea, can never go back to its original dimensions," said Oliver Wendell Holmes. Surely the articulate discussions of modern correctional theories and techniques found in some of these reports will stretch the mind of the citizen reader enough to let light enter for his ignorance, heat for his sympathies, and resolution to join the vast and dedicated army of rehabilitation which is correction.

I cannot conclude this article without a farewell to Edmond FitzGerald, New York parole commissioner, whose death on March 7 pained us all. With high Irish humor, a keen intelligence, and a heart full of the realization that he was indeed his brother's keeper, he endeared himself to everyone who came into his professional and social realm. Probation and parole, whose cause he advanced, will miss him, and people will miss him.

Reports Received

June 1, 1959 — March 1, 1960

(Annual and biennial reports should be forwarded to the NPPA Library at the Association's headquarters, 1790 Broadway, New York 19, N.Y.)

CITY AND COUNTY

Arkansas

Pulaski County (Little Rock) Juvenile Court, 1958

California

Imperial County (El Centro) Probation Dept., 1958

Los Angeles County (Los Angeles) Probation Dept., 1958/59

Marin County (San Rafael) Probation Dept. Work Furlough Program, 1958/1959

Orange County (Santa Ana) Probation Dept., 1958

Riverside County (Riverside) Probation Dept., 1958

San Francisco County (San Francisco) Adult Probation Dept., 1958/59

San Mateo County (Redwood City) Probation Dept., 1958

Solano County (Fairfield) Probation Officer, 1958

Colorado

Probation Dept., 1st and 17th Judicial Districts, 1958

Delaware

New Castle County (Wilmington) Family Court, 1957-1958

Florida

Dade County (Miami) Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, 1959

Pinellas County (St. Petersburg) Juvenile Welfare Board, 1958/59

Georgia

Chatham County (Savannah) Family Court, 1958

Floyd County (Rome) Juvenile Court, 1959

Fulton County (Atlanta) Juvenile Court, 1958

Muscogee County (Columbus) Juvenile Court, 1958

Hawaii

Juvenile Court, First Judicial District
(Honolulu) 1957-1958

Illinois

Chicago Crime Commission, 1958
Chicago Municipal Court, Boys' Court—
Report on Youthful Offenders, 1958
Sangamon County (Springfield) Family
Court, 1957/58

Indiana

Elkhart Superior Court Adult and Juve-
nile Probation Office, 1958
Marion County (Indianapolis) Juvenile
Court, 1958

Iowa

Scott County (Davenport) Probation Of-
fice, 1958

Louisiana

East Baton Rouge Parish (Baton Rouge)
Family Court, 1958

Maryland

Baltimore City Supreme Bench Domestic
Relations Division, 1958
Baltimore City Supreme Bench Probation
Dept., 1958
Washington County (Hagerstown) Juve-
nile Court—*Saturday Citizenship Train-
ing Program*, 1958/59

Michigan

Probation Dept., Third Judicial Circuit
(Detroit), 1958/59
Kalamazoo County (Kalamazoo) Juvenile
Court, 1959
Wayne County (Detroit) Juvenile Court,
1958

Minnesota

Freeborn County (Albert Lea) Probation
Office, 1959
Ramsey County (St. Paul) Detention and
Corrections Authority, 1958
Ramsey County (St. Paul) Probation
Dept., 1959
Scott County (Shakopee) Probation Dept.,
1958

Missouri

Jackson County (Kansas City) Juvenile
Court, 1957/58

St. Louis County (Clayton) Dept. of Pub-
lic Welfare—*Adult Probation and Pa-
role*, 1959

St. Louis County (Clayton) Juvenile
Court, 1958

St. Louis City Courts Parole and Probation
Dept., 1958/59

St. Louis Circuit Court for Criminal
Causes, Probation and Parole Office,
1958

Montana

Eighteenth Judicial District (Bozeman)
Juvenile Dept., 1958

New Jersey

Essex County (Newark) Juvenile and Do-
mestic Relations Court, 1958

Essex County (Newark) Probation Office,
1958

Mercer County (Trenton) Probation
Dept., 1958

New York State

Broome County (Binghamton) Probation
Dept., 1959

Monroe County (Rochester) Children's
Court, 1958

New York City Dept. of Corrections, 1958

New York City Domestic Relations Court,
1958

New York City Magistrates' Courts, 1958

New York City Police Dept.—*Crime in
New York City*, 1959

Oneida County (Rome and Utica) Chil-
dren's Court, 1958

North Carolina

Gaston County (Gastonia) Domestic Re-
lations and Juvenile Court 1958/59

Guilford County (Greensboro) Domestic
Relations Court, 1958

Mecklenburg County (Charlotte) Juve-
nile and Domestic Court, Psychological
Services Division, 1959

Ohio

Cleveland Municipal Court Probation
Dept., 1958

Cleveland Police Dept., 1958

Cuyahoga County (Cleveland) Common
Pleas Court Probation Dept., 1958

Cuyahoga County (Cleveland) Juvenile
Court, 1959

Erie County (Sandusky) Court of Common Pleas, Adult Probation Dept., 1958
Jefferson County (Steubenville) Juvenile Court, 1958

Montgomery County (Dayton) Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, 1958
Muskingum County (Zanesville) Juvenile Court, 1959

Oklahoma

Oklahoma County (Oklahoma City) Children's Court, 1958

Oregon

Multnomah County (Portland) Juvenile Court and Juvenile Home, 1958

Pennsylvania

Cumberland County (Carlisle) Probation Office, 1958

Franklin County (Chambersburg) Correction Dept., 1958

Lancaster County Court Probation and Parole Dept., 1958

Lehigh County (Allentown) Probation Office, 1958

Luzerne County (Wilkes-Barre) Controller, 1958

Northampton County (Easton) Probation and Parole Office, Domestic Relations and Collection Division, 1958

Philadelphia Youth Study Center, 1956-1958

South Carolina

Greenwood County (Greenwood) Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, 1958/59

South Dakota

Pennington County (Rapid City) Court Juvenile Division, 1958

Virginia

Arlington County (Arlington) Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, 1958

Norfolk Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, 1958

Richmond Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court, 1958

Washington

Yakima County (Yakima) Juvenile Dept., 1958

West Virginia

Kanawha County (Charleston) Intermediate Court Probation Dept., 1958/59

Wisconsin

La Crosse County (La Crosse) Dept. of Public Welfare, 1958

STATE

Alabama Board of Pardons and Paroles, 1958/59

Alabama Board of Pensions and Security, 1958/59 (in *Alabama Social Welfare*, Nov.-Dec., 1959)

California Bureau of Criminal Statistics—*Crime in California*, 1958

California Bureau of Criminal Statistics—*Summary of California Juvenile Hall Activities*, 1958

California Bureau of Criminal Statistics—*Delinquency and Probation in California*, 1958

California Dept. of Corrections, 1957-1958

California Dept. of Corrections—*Characteristics of Resident Population of California State Prisons by Institution*, 1958

California Youth Authority—*Annual Statistical Report*, 1958

California Youth Authority—*Probation Progress*, 1959

Connecticut Juvenile Court, 1958

Connecticut Digest of Administrative Reports to the Governor, 1958-1959

Delaware Youth Services Commission, 1958/59

District of Columbia Juvenile Court, 1958/1959

District of Columbia Juvenile Court—*Annual Statistical Report*, 1958/59

District of Columbia Municipal Court Alcoholic Rehabilitation Program, 1958/1959

Florida Dept. of Public Welfare—*Florida Juvenile Court Statistics*, 1958

Florida Parole Commission, 1958

Hawaii Board of Pardons and Paroles, 1958/59

Idaho Division of Mental Health, Youth Rehabilitation Section, 1958/59

Illinois Youth Commission, 1957-1958

Indiana Division of Parole, 1958/59

- Kentucky Welfare Dept., 1958/59
- Louisiana Dept. of Institutions, 1958/59
- Louisiana Dept. of Public Welfare, 1958/59
- Maine Probation and Parole Board, 1958/59
- Maryland Board of Correction—*Report of the Inspection of the County Jails of Maryland*, 1959
- Maryland Dept. of Correction, 1956/57
- Massachusetts Commissioner on Alcoholism, 1958
- Massachusetts Commissioner of Correction, 1957
- Michigan Corrections Commission, 1958
- Michigan Dept. of Corrections—*Cases Disposed of in 1958, Judicial Criminal Statistics*
- Michigan Dept. of Corrections, Bureau of Probation—*Adult Probation Report*, 1958
- Michigan Dept. of Social Welfare—*Michigan Juvenile Court Reporting*, 1958
- Minnesota Board of Parole and Probation, 1956-1958
- Mississippi Dept. of Public Welfare—*Youth Court Statistics*, 1958
- Mississippi Probation and Parole Board, 1955-1957
- Missouri Board of Probation and Parole, 1958/59
- New Hampshire Dept. of Probation, 1957-1958
- New Jersey Bureau of Parole—*Annual Report of Earnings of Parolees*, 1958
- New Jersey Dept. of Institutions and Agencies, 1958
- New Jersey Youth Study Commission, 1958/59
- New Mexico Commission on Youth, 1958/59
- New Mexico Dept. of Welfare—*Characteristics of Children in Juvenile Delinquency Cases Disposed of by New Mexico Juvenile Courts*, 1958
- New York State Commissioner of Correction—*Major Crimes in New York State*, 1959
- New York State Dept. of Social Welfare—*New York State Social Statistics*, 1957
- New York State Division of Parole, 1958
- New York State Division of Parole—*Facts and Figures of the Division of Parole*, 1959
- New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Matrimonial and Family Laws, 1959
- Ohio Bureau of Research and Statistics—*Ohio Juvenile Court Statistics*, 1958
- Ohio Bureau of Research and Statistics—*Ohio Judicial Criminal Statistics*, 1958
- Oregon Board of Parole and Probation, 1956-1958
- Pennsylvania Board of Parole, 1958/59
- Pennsylvania Board of Parole—*Statistical Report*, 1958/59
- Pennsylvania Bureau of Correction—*Pennsylvania Judicial Statistics*, 1958
- Rhode Island Bureau of Probation and Parole, 1958/59
- Rhode Island Juvenile Court, 1956/57
- Rhode Island Parole Board, 1957/58
- South Carolina Probation, Parole and Pardon Board, 1957/58
- Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles, 1957/58
- Utah Bureau of Services for Children—*Biennial Report of the Director Concerning the Administration of the Juvenile Courts*, 1956-1958
- Virginia Dept. of Welfare and Institutions, 1957/58
- Washington State Dept. of Institutions, 1956-1958
- Washington State Division of Children and Youth Services—*Washington State Juvenile Court Statistics*, 1957
- Wisconsin Division of Children and Youth, 1956-1958
- Wisconsin Division of Children and Youth—*Wisconsin Juvenile Court Report*, 1958

Wisconsin Division of Children and Youth
—*Juvenile Law Enforcement Report*,
1956-1957

Wyoming Dept. of Probation and Parole,
1957-1959

FEDERAL

U.S. Board of Parole, 1957/58

U.S. Bureau of Prisons—*Prisoners in State
and Federal Institutions*, 1958 (*National
Prisoner Statistics*, No. 21)

U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation—
*Uniform Crime Reports for the United
States*, 1958

FOREIGN

Canada Commissioner of Penitentiaries,
1957/58

Canadian Corrections Association, 1959

Jamaica, B.W.I.—*Annual Colonial Report*,
Probation, 1958

New South Wales (Australia) Child Wel-
fare Dept., 1957/58

New Zealand Dept. of Education—*Child
Welfare*, 1959

Newfoundland Dept. of Public Welfare,
1958/59

Puerto Rico Administrative Director of
the Courts, 1957/58

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1957/58

ASSOCIATIONS, ETC.

American Civil Liberties Union, 1958/59

American Law Institute, 1959

Berkshire Farm for Boys, 1958/59

Boys Clubs of America, 1958

Citizens' Committee for Children of New
York City, 1958/59

Community Council of Greater New York,
1959

Community Service Society of New York,
1957/58

Community Welfare Council, Hennepin
County (Minn.), Research Dept.—*Juve-
nile Delinquency in Minneapolis*, 1958

Crime Prevention Association of Phila-
delphia—*Juvenile Delinquency in 1958*

Ford Foundation, 1957/58

George W. Henry Foundation, 1958/59

Judicial Conference of the State of New
York, 1959

Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Founda-
tion, 1959

National Association for Mental Health,
1958

National Child Labor Committee, 1958

National Information Bureau, 1958

New York School of Social Work, Dean,
1958/59

Prison Association of New York, 1958

Protestant Council of the City of New
York, 1958/59

Rosenberg Foundation, 1958

Special Service for Groups, Los Angeles,
1959

United Prison Association of Massachu-
setts, 1958

University of Southern California Youth
Studies Center, 1958/59

Waterfront Commission of New York
Harbor, 1958/59

Young Men's Christian Associations, Na-
tional Board, 1958/59

Letters to the Editor

Clergy-Labor-Management Experiment in Institutional Vocational Training

February 1, 1960

TO THE EDITOR:

Some years ago the writer, Executive Vice-President of Special Social Services, invited a group of chaplains of the three major faiths and labor and management officials to discuss the problem of vocational training in the correctional institutions of New York State. Aware of the need for more modern machines and greater scope in the vocational training program in the institutional shops, and of limited appropriations for them, this group initiated a clergy-labor-management experiment in cooperation with the institutions.

Under the plan, the chaplains would insure development of the program on the highest principles; labor would help perfect more realistic trade training programs for better rehabilitation of the inmates; management would give or lend up-to-date machines and tools; the social worker would serve as coordinator among the groups and as liaison with state correctional officials.

The Chaplains Committee of Special Social Services is comprised of Luther K. Hannum, Jr., Resident Protestant Chaplain at Sing Sing Prison and Past President of the State Protestant Correctional Chaplains Association; Father George F. McKinney, Catholic Chaplain at Sing Sing Prison and Past President of the American Correctional Chaplains Association; and Rabbi Simon Resnikoff, spiritual leader of Temple Gates of Zion, Val-

ley Stream, N. Y., and long active in civic affairs.

The Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York and Vicinity (now the New York City Central Labor Council) became actively interested in this experiment. Arthur L. Harckham, then Chairman of the Welfare and Health Committee of the Council, took charge of the early planning and visits to institutions. Presently Chairman of the Community Services Committee of the Council and Secretary-Treasurer of Local 32-B, International Building Services Employees Union, he continues his sincere interest in this experiment.

Moe Rosen, Vice-President of the New York State Federation of Labor, Vice-President of the New York City Central Labor Council, and First Vice-President of the Sheet Metal Workers International Association (AFL-CIO), has been active from the beginning of the clergy-labor-management experiment. (Thirty years ago, as a member of a commission appointed by Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt, he played a major role in a state prison vocational shop survey.)

James C. Quinn, Secretary of the Council and editor of its official publication, *Labor Chronicle*, also participated actively in the experiment from the beginning.

Another member of the labor group who cooperated seriously from the onset is Louis F. Donato, Executive Secretary of the Allied Printing Trades Council of Greater New York.

Al Manuti, President of Local 802, American Federation of Musicians,

contributed a music library to the New York State Training School for Boys (Warwick) and the assistance of Kathryn E. Jisi, his social service supervisor, who accompanied labor leaders on institutional visits when music needs were involved.

About three years ago Edward Friss, Vice-President of the International Leather Goods, Plastics and Novelty Workers' Union (AFL-CIO) and Manager of Joint Boards for New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and New England, set up a training shop at the New York Training School for Girls (Hudson) in cooperation with the National Authority of the Ladies Handbag Industry, which, representing management, lent machines at no cost to the state. This was the first shop established in the experiment.

The next venture was the gift of a machine for the woodwork shop at the New York State Vocational Institution (Coxsackie) by Edward Bass, President of Rudolph Bass Co., New York City. Labor and management officials are now much interested in the program at this institution.

Hon. Paul D. McGinnis, New York State Commissioner of Correction, commenting on this experiment, predicted that it would bring about great changes in vocational training in the state.

SYLVIA N. RACHLIN

Executive Vice-President, Special Social Services, New York City

Employment of Youth

October 29, 1959

TO THE EDITOR:

With all the headlines about delinquency it is important to remember that this is only one of many juvenile problems, only one possible reaction

to the difficult atmosphere created by rapid technological development, population changes, and world tensions.

Employment is one of the major problem areas for youth listed by state committees planning for the Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth. Today's teenagers face the biggest demands in history for education and training, a dizzying choice of rapidly changing job titles (more than 30,000), the stiffest competition for jobs (from their own zooming population, from machines, and from preferred experienced workers). Unemployment for this age group is twice that of the national average. These teen-agers need help in planning for, choosing, and getting suitable jobs, as well as assistance in adjusting to jobs when they get them.

We think your readers will be interested to hear that a national non-profit service has just been created to concentrate on these problems. It is the National Committee on Employment of Youth, a division of the 55-year-old National Child Labor Committee. The new committee was created to "promote the welfare of society with respect to the employment of children in gainful occupations" (the mandate of N.C.L.C.'s 1907 Congressional charter) in the light of present-day conditions.

The National Committee on Employment of Youth continues the campaign for good labor standards in commercial agriculture (where child labor still exists), especially among the children of migratory workers. It also develops public understanding of youth-employment problems, encourages services that prepare youngsters for suitable and satisfying jobs, and stimulates increased work opportunities under proper safeguards and conditions.

It uses the tools of public information, consultation, demonstration, field service, national social planning, and research. The new agency co-operates closely with government agencies, national and local youth-serving organizations, educators, employers, organized labor, and other groups that share its interest in bettering the lives of America's children and youth.

The National Committee on Employment of Youth will be glad to hear from any of your readers who want more information on youth employment. The address is 419 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

LILA ROSENBLUM

Director of Public Information, National Committee on Employment of Youth

•

Court Clinic

December 16, 1959

TO THE EDITOR:

This letter is long overdue. When I wrote "Rehabilitating the Alcoholic Woman" for the January, 1957 issue of the NPPA JOURNAL, you mentioned you would be interested to hear whether our efforts ever came to fruition. This miracle happened within a few months after the article's appearance.

The Psychiatric Clinic of the Municipal Court was established in Cincinnati on March 6, 1957, when the judges of the Municipal Court requested the City Council to create

such a facility under provisions of Ohio law which empower municipal court judges to appoint a court psychiatrist.

On April 1, 1957, the clinic was opened with a staff consisting of a part-time psychiatrist, a full-time psychologist, a full-time psychiatric social worker, and an executive secretary.

My purpose here is not to describe the clinic, its excellent work, and its growth, but to give credit to Ralph B. Kohnen (then presiding judge of the Municipal Court, now judge of the Common Pleas Court), without whose courageous support and belief in psychiatric help for the court our cause would have been stymied. And to point with pride to the accomplishment of a determined, hard-working group of women who took their civic responsibilities seriously.

It was seven long years of laying the groundwork, of getting the law into the Ohio statutes, of fighting and speaking and writing and advocating the need for a clinic which would help the judges dispense a better quality of justice in the "People's Court."

Horace Mann said to the class of 1859: "I beseech you to treasure up in your hearts these, my parting words: Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity."

MRS. MEYER SALKOVER

1316 Avon Drive, Cincinnati 29, Ohio

News & Notes

Edmond FitzGerald, a member of the New York parole board since 1957, died of a heart attack in Albany on March 7. He was fifty-seven years old.

Prior to his parole board appointment, Mr. FitzGerald was chief probation officer of the Kings County Court (Brooklyn, N. Y.), a position to which he had been appointed in 1940. In 1949 he took a leave of absence to help the new state of Israel establish its probation system. He was a member of the NPPA Professional Council and Editorial Advisory Board.

Irving Ben Cooper, Chief Justice of the Court of Special Sessions of the City of New York and Chairman of the Criminal Courts Section of NPPA's Advisory Council of Judges, resigned from the bench on March 1. The following is his letter of resignation to Mayor Robert F. Wagner:

January 5, 1960

DEAR MR. MAYOR:

My attempt during the past few months to lessen the personal wear and tear in my approach to the enormous challenges presented daily in this Court, accompanied as they are by constant anxiety, irritation, and strain, has not succeeded. Accordingly, after a recent physical check-up, I have finally decided to take the advice of physician and family and leave this post. Please consider this my letter of resignation effective next March 1 (on that day thirty years ago I began my public work with Judge Samuel Seabury).

A persistent and ever-increasing panorama of misery presented by complain-

ants and accused, demanding as is their right under law that justice be done and always involving issues vital to them and the community is, and we must expect it to be, endlessly pressing. Nevertheless, I leave with reluctance and sadness, for here I have functioned as trial justice and administrative head for nearly twenty-one years, and I had hoped to complete my present term of judicial service, which expires June 30, 1966.

This is not to say that there have not been deep and abiding satisfactions. Among other advances, I have seen this Court valiantly struggle to mete out justice under the incessant strain of burgeoning calendars and limited facilities in all departments. Merely disposing of heavy calendars is not, for us, the rendition of justice; there is no more certain way of getting the majority of the very same offenders back in Court again. Then, too, the concept of probation and allied professional services, which we have long advocated and which you have supported, is beginning to be better understood by the public and is being recognized more and more by governmental authorities throughout our state. When this is appropriately implemented, and only then, will judges be enabled to determine in enlightened manner who must be confined and for how long and where, and who by rehabilitation under the Court's supervision may eventually line up with the orderly citizen.

I thank you, Mr. Mayor, for making funds available to this Court for some of its basic services. We did not have even that before you acted. I would be remiss, however, if I failed to emphasize that each day furnishes overwhelming evidence, in this and courts with similar jurisdiction throughout the land, of the wisdom of Mr. Justice Cardozo's observation that if advanced stages of criminality are to be largely averted, courts must be equip-

ped to know the first offender as a human being as well as the act which brings him before the court and in that way discover "the course that he is going." Indeed that same evidence, so abundant daily, incontrovertibly supports the warning, which we avoid at our peril, by Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes: "...Look after the courts of the poor, who stand most in need of justice. The security of the Republic will be found in the treatment of the poor and ignorant; in indifference to their misery and helplessness lies disaster."

IRVING BEN COOPER

Harry L. Eastman, Presiding Judge of the Cuyahoga County Juvenile Court, Cleveland, has announced that he will retire on May 15—the anniversary of his appointment in 1926 as judge of the old Insolvency and Juvenile Court. He is seventy-eight.

He started out in life—having left high school in his junior year because his parents could not afford to keep him there—as a photoengraver. In 1913 he received his LL.B. degree from Western Reserve University Law School, was admitted to the bar, and set up in private practice.

When Judge Eastman was appointed to the Insolvency and Juvenile Court he found that the court's two functions were incompatible and that it lacked proper facilities and trained personnel. Eventually the legislature established the juvenile court as an independent entity. It was housed in a social welfare building where court, mothers' pension department, detention home, and County Child Welfare Board could be combined. Judge Eastman's accomplishments include staffing the court with professional probation workers and a court psychiatrist, and creating a child sup-

port department. His court also has a reference library, a department of statistics and research, and a legal advisor; a training program for staff workers is run in conjunction with Western Reserve University's School of Applied Social Sciences.

Judge Eastman has been a member of the NPPA Board of Trustees; his article on "The Juvenile Court Judge's Job" appeared in the NPPA JOURNAL, October, 1959.

In announcing his decision to resign, Judge Eastman said, "I feel I have accomplished all that I can. I think the job should be turned over to a younger person with energy and fresh ideas."

The following is the text of a "Certificate of Appreciation" awarded by George D. Clyde, Governor, and J. Allan Crockett, Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court, Utah, to Rulon W. Clark, Judge of the Utah Juvenile Court from 1933-59, at his retirement in January:

"For faithful and industrious devotion to duty; for warm and human sympathy and understanding; for fine abilities and exemplary qualities and character; dedicated to the administration of justice for our children and youth, thus making a significant and lasting contribution to the welfare of our community and state."

On January 26, Gilbert Rodli, President of the John R. Wald Company (see pp. 146-151 above) celebrated his thirty-fifth anniversary with the firm at a banquet given in his honor by more than 200 associates and correctional officials.

Mr. Rodli's company, which was founded in 1924, is the only one in the United States to be exclusively concerned with industrial development in prisons. It has established over 200 industries providing employment and training to many thousands of inmates in prisons throughout the United States and Canada.

NPPA Staff Additions

Dr. Hyman H. Frankel has been appointed director of NPPA's new National Research and Information Clearing Center on Crime and Delinquency. Dr. Frankel (Ph. D. in Sociology, University of Illinois) has taught courses in criminology and juvenile delinquency at the University of Illinois, the University of Indiana, and most recently at Southern Illinois University. Among his previous research projects are an analysis of "The Methodology of the Social Services," studies for the Illinois Parole and Pardon Board, studies of juvenile delinquency in Cook County, and participation in the American Bar Foundation's study of "The Administration of Criminal Justice in the United States."

Raymond F. Scannell joined the staff on February 8 as consultant to the Advisory Council of Judges, whose major project for the next three years is a legislative and action program to aid courts and communities in dealing with the problem of the youthful offender. Mr. Scannell was, from 1955, administrative case supervisor and director of social service at Lincoln Hall, and, before that, a unit supervisor for the New York City Youth Board. He is a graduate of Boston College (B.A., 1941) and the Boston College School of Social Service (M.S.W., 1947).

Herman S. Shepard joined the staff on March 23 as Eastern regional consultant for the development of Citizen Action Program committees. Mr. Shepard has a background of fourteen years of community organization with the National Council of Jewish Women. He is a graduate of New York University (B.A., 1939) and the New York School of Social Work, Columbia University (M.S., 1944).

Joseph L. Thimm joined the staff on March 30 as consultant to the Washington Citizens Council (Citizen Action Program). Mr. Thimm was casework supervisor and referee at the Multnomah County (Portland, Ore.) Juvenile Court, where he had worked since 1951; earlier he had been employed by the National Catholic Welfare Conference on a special project for displaced persons in Germany. He is a graduate of the University of Detroit (Ph.B., 1949) and the Catholic University of America, School of Social Service (M.S.W., 1951).

(Joseph R. Rowan, who has been consultant to the Washington and Montana CAP committees, is moving to the San Francisco regional office; he will be in charge of organizing new CAP committees in the Western states.)

Warren S. Woodall joined the staff on March 30 as consultant to the Michigan Council on Crime and Delinquency (Citizen Action Program). Mr. Woodall has served as administrator at the Marion County (Indianapolis) Juvenile Center, Los Angeles County Juvenile Hall, and MacLaren Hall (Los Angeles County Probation Department), and worked for five years as reporter and editor on

the *Illinois State Journal*. He is a graduate of the University of Illinois School of Journalism (B.S.) and Indiana University (M.A. in Social Service).

(Willis Thomas, who has been consultant to the Michigan and Indiana CAP committees, is moving to the Chicago regional office; he will be in charge of organizing new CAP committees in the Midwestern states.)

Offender-Employment Notes

In May, 1959, the United Prison Association of Massachusetts sponsored an Employers' Conference at the Walpole State Prison (see NPPA JOURNAL, January, 1960, p. 105) to acquaint prospective employers with inmates' job training and to encourage them to hire parolees. Bernard F. McSally, Supervisor of the Men's Division of the Association, has reported the results.

Union officials and about eighty representatives from manufacturing, construction, retail businesses, and service companies attended the conference. Twenty-seven firms said that they were willing to discuss employment possibilities; their personnel needs were subsequently catalogued. Within five months after the conference eighteen offenders were placed on these newly available jobs. Many more jobs are in the offing. Placements have moved slowly because of the pains taken to match the man to the job, in order to keep failures to a minimum and so encourage employers to hire again.

Perhaps more important than the quantity of these new jobs, Mr. McSally says, is their quality. In the past, it was often more difficult to place a skilled parolee than an un-

skilled one (the skilled machinist, for example, often had to accept a dishwashing job to get his release). Some progress has been made in this direction: of the eighteen parolees placed, eleven are employed in skilled capacities.

The results have encouraged plans to make the conference an annual one.

The BARO Civic Center Clinic (Brooklyn Association for the Rehabilitation of Offenders, 44 Wiloughby Street, Brooklyn 1, N.Y.; see NPPA JOURNAL, January, 1959) is conducting a spring seminar on the role of vocational planning in the treatment of adult offenders. The seminar provides an opportunity to explore such areas as the different meanings that work has for the worker, the difference between planning a career and getting a job, vocational adjustment, vocational choice as an expression of self-concept, aptitude testing and other techniques, the use of community resources for employment and vocational guidance, and the handling of legal and psychological barriers to employment. Participants are invited to present active cases for discussion and consultation. Genevieve P. Hunter, Associate Professor, Graduate Department of Education, Fordham University, is directing the seminar.

The Employment Bureau of the Kings County Court (Brooklyn, N.Y.) probation department is distributing a circular to express its "Thanks . . . 2,000 times" to all those who have helped it to place 2,000 men and women—apprentices, skilled and semi-skilled workers, domestic help, and laborers. For further in-

form
Dir
Kin
par
Bro
38)

C
pres

F
Oct

T
in s
ing,
appl
at t
Serv
port

F
ney
Stan

G
that
of t
A
on Y
who
find
since
thor

A
11 b
time
sever

T
June
gran
yout
a wa
W

Virg
repr
bacc
the
coun
jobs.

T
were
betw
delin

formation, phone or write Sol Tropp, Director of Employment Placement, Kings County Court Probation Department, 120 Schermerhorn Street, Brooklyn 1, N.Y. (MAin 4-5300, Ext. 38).

Offender-employment notes in the press:

From the Shreveport, La., *Journal*, Oct. 16, 1959:

The eagerness of our Shreveport youth in seeking employment has been amazing, as evidenced by the more than 1,330 applications received in one year's time at the YES office (Youth Employment Service) of the Sertoma Club of Shreveport.

From an article by Sharon Moloney in the Cincinnati *Post and Times Star*, Nov. 16, 1959:

Getting jobs for youngsters and seeing that they keep them may be a big part of the answer to juvenile delinquency.

A report from the Citizens Committee on Youth shows not one of 29 delinquents who participated in the committee's job-finding Youth Development Project has since been in trouble with juvenile authorities.

At the end of the 14-month project, 11 boys held permanent full-time or part-time jobs, and 11 held odd jobs. Only seven have not worked at all.

The project was started by the CCY on June 15, 1958, as an experimental program designed to seek out unemployed youths, find and help them keep jobs as a way of preventing juvenile delinquency.

William J. Moore, a graduate of West Virginia State College and former sales representative of the R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., was named project worker—the "leg man" who contacted the boys, counseled and guided them and got them jobs.

The 29 boys selected for the project were out of school, unemployed boys between 16 and 18 who lived in high delinquency areas of the city.

All had juvenile court records. Most were from the lowest income families, were below average in intelligence and were not normally employable. The majority were from broken homes and were unable to "adjust" to school. None had any work experience.

After interviewing the boys and their parents, Mr. Moore found the youths' primary interest was in getting money. They had little or no interest in taking courses or training to increase their skills.

So Mr. Moore and his four-member advisory committee got them jobs through the Ohio State Unemployment Bureau, small business, industry, fraternal, civic and social welfare organizations, and private homes.

To keep the boys on the job, Mr. Moore did everything from getting one boy to cut his hair after an employer complained he looked like a "hood," to waking up boys who had overslept and rushing them to work on time in his own car.

In addition to finding jobs for his 29 project boys, Mr. Moore and his committee placed more than 100 other delinquent youths referred by other agencies to jobs project boys could not handle.

At the end of 14 months, the CCY found its project had far exceeded its "success" goals of six boys in permanent, full-time jobs, incidence of juvenile court cases by project boys cut in half, and money earned by boys equal to the project cost.

From the Salt Lake City *Deseret News*, Jan. 22, 1960:

The youngster with a steady job and money to take his girl to a movie occasionally is less likely to come under the influence of a juvenile gang.

This is one of the axioms behind a pioneering effort by the Lower Eastside Neighborhoods Association (LENA) comprised of social-welfare and labor leaders to find jobs for hard-to-place youngsters in New York's lower East Side. The organization, in the three years of its devoted efforts, has placed upward of 275 boys and a few girls.

Two boys for whom jobs were found represent typical situations. One was a 19-year-old Puerto Rican, a juvenile gang leader, who says he is going to have a tough time breaking away because the gang does not want to lose him. He was given a job on the assembly line of a manufacturer in Manhattan. He had lost two other jobs because he was found carrying a zip gun.

The other lad, who also had to break with his gang, is an 18-year-old Italian who does not have a record but is known among the street mobs as "a good guy to have on your side in a brawl." He also got an assembly-line job.

The work of LENA in New York City has attracted considerable attention nationally and is now being extended into St. Louis, Chicago, Detroit, and Los Angeles.

These so-called "hangers" (kids that hang around) are important young people to reach because generally they are so precariously on the fence. Youngsters hanging around unemployed are potential delinquents to be sure, but given a new start can become useful, happy citizens.

"Gang members have a terribly intense wish to be somebody, to achieve something," said Mrs. Rose Porter, executive director of LENA. "But at the same time they have this pessimistic, fatalistic feeling that they can never be anybody. A job usually will break through this fatalism."

The juvenile gang problem has not reared its ugly head very high in Salt Lake City thus far but we do have in the juvenile court, the Salt Lake Area Vocational School and Boys Home, to mention a few, devoted workers in the cause of procuring employment for hard-to-place boys who otherwise would roam the streets. Some of the youngsters they place are on the "tough" side and employers are cautioned that they need just a little more help and attention than the usual employee.

To be placed in an atmosphere where men put in an honest day's work for an honest day's pay is exactly the proper influence for these out-of-step youngsters. Civic groups, banks, settlement houses,

athletic clubs, labor unions, and churches can do tremendous good in this business of turning potential delinquents into solid citizens.

From the *New York Times*, Feb. 14, 1960:

East Harlem adults who are helping the community's twenty-four youth clubs through the clubs' organization, the East Harlem Youth Council, are wrestling with a bigger problem now than getting the clubs to work together.

This is to find work for many of the area's 1,500 youths between the ages of 17 and 22 who have records as youthful offenders as a result of gang wars that raged until the clubs established peace in July, 1959. The youths involved believe their past records keep them from getting any kind of job that offers them betterment. They believe they are condemned to casual heavy labor.

George G. Lichtmacher, one of the adult advisers to the council, expressed the hope that business men's organizations would interest themselves in the problem and see what can be done about it before spring, when unemployed youths must while away their time loitering in the streets.

From the *Los Angeles Herald and Express*, Feb. 1, 1960:

Here is Point No. 2 of the 14-point program [of Gov. Edmund G. Brown's Advisory Committee on Children and Youth]:

"Jobs for Youth: More jobs should be made available for young people, particularly school drop-outs and the delinquency-prone, through committees which include labor, management, schools, the Department of Employment, and the State Division of Apprenticeship Standards."

The committee concluded that "Many young people get into difficulty because their failure in school is compounded by their later failure to obtain a satisfactory job."

From the Salt Lake City *Tribune*, Oct. 16, 1959:

At a recent tour of the prison the grand jury recommended expansion of the industry and more use of the land at the prison.

Mr. Curtis [member of the Utah State Board of Corrections in charge of the two prisons] said the work programs at the prison are being stepped up as fast as possible, but added it takes money to purchase items needed for expansion of the industries program...

Ernest Dean Wright, executive director, reported extensive investigations into soap industry and the state printing—as suggested by the grand jury—shows these two would not be feasible at the present time.

Expense of setting up the soap factory and cost of producing it in competition to prices of commercial manufacturers just about rule this out, he said.

He said that the proposal to have the prison do all the printing for the state has met with violent opposition by the private printing concerns.

From the Allentown, Pa., *Call-Chronicle*, Oct. 11, 1959:

The Allentown Area Parole Advisers' Group is an association of men who believe that after a man has served his term for a crime he should be given a "break." It saves taxpayers' money, it saves men. . . . Charles N. Bell, who, more than five years ago, started the group, [pointed out]:

"The great need today is for jobs for these men. That is why we all get to work on this angle. We pass on leads to each other—it's rough to try to call someone on the phone 'cold' and ask him to give a job to a parolee.

"And yet I sat in a hotel lobby one time and got talking about this work to a fellow beside me and asked if he was doing any hiring at his plant. It ended that I got a job for a boy who was a year overdue to get out.

"You see, the great advantage that the employer has is that he knows more about

his parolee employee than he does about any other employee. He gets a psychiatric report on him, he is given a report on his character, his family and his habits. Several large firms in the area accept parolees because of this and when one leaves they take another."

One of the big problems of getting jobs for ex-prisoners is that whereas the average age of the paroled prisoner used to be 30 to 40, it now is 20 to 30 and few of the men have trades or even have worked at a job.

From an article by Dr. Walter C. Alvarez in the New York *Herald Tribune*, Oct. 24, 1958:

We are constantly being told that many men, when discharged from a state or federal prison, promptly go back to crime. We blame the men for this, but we are at fault, too. We fail to see to it that when the ex-convict comes out he gets a job. . . .

[Bill Martin, in the "K. P. Telescope," a journal published by the prisoners in Kingston Penitentiary in Canada] says that when a prisoner goes free and starts hunting for a job, if the trade he has learned in prison is unionized, he is likely to have trouble joining the union. Some unions won't recognize as of any value the education the man was given in prison, and hence this training may prove useless to him.

From the Memphis *Press-Scimitar*, Jan. 9, 1960:

The State Pardons and Paroles Board used to serve as "an employment office for slave labor."

And worse, possibly, was the racket of parole sponsors who demanded pay from parolees to act as their sponsors. . . .

Voluntary parole employers and sponsors used to appear frequently on the scene, said Charles Crow, secretary of the board. The minimum pay that the board used to require for a parolee was \$30 a month plus room and board.

"Many took advantage of it to give jobs to parolees," he said. "This was just an employment office for slave labor."

"We found one parolee on the job trying to clean out a fence row with a butcher knife, and his hands were bleeding," Mr. Crow continued. "He was afraid to complain because he thought he might have to go back to prison."

The board raised the minimum pay for a parolee to \$45 plus room and board. Although that amount, too, seems far too low, it had an effect. Crow said, "Our list of voluntary parole employers immediately dwindled."

Advisory Council of Judges

The Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Inc., of Reynolda, N.C., whose generous grant has sustained the Advisory Council of Judges of NPPA since it was founded in 1953, has renewed the grant for a three-year period.

In addition to continuing the judicial council's usual activities, the grant will enable the ACJ to concentrate for the next three years on the problem of the young offender, particularly the group just beyond juvenile court age. The ACJ will develop a legislative and action program to aid the courts and communities in meeting the problem of youth crime. Raymond F. Scannell, the council's special consultant for this purpose, will be studying existing resources, in all sections of the country, dealing with community efforts in prevention and treatment; court procedures, including such things as the New York youthful offender procedure; and institutional, probation, and parole services for youthful offenders. Among other products of this work will be the publication of authoritative standards as

a guide to communities, legislatures, and the correctional field.

National Survey Service

A joint survey service for states and communities requesting studies of social services for children and families with problems has been established by the National Probation and Parole Association, the Child Welfare League of America, the Family Service Association of America, and the National Travelers Aid Association. An allocation of \$12,000 to start the service has been made by the United Community Defense Services. The surveys will be done on a cost basis; plans call for the project to be self-supporting within the first year. Maurice Hunt, Maryland's state director of child welfare services, has been appointed as director of the survey service effective April 1, 1960. This cooperative step by the four national standard-setting agencies will offer a broad survey service which previously was available only through individuals or independent survey groups that have no responsibility to national standards or to a national board of trustees.

Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency

The first project of the Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency (see NPPA JOURNAL, January, 1960) is the International Survey of Correctional Practice and Research. Working on it under the direction of Richard A. McGee, California Director of Corrections, and president of the Institute, are Clyde E. Sullivan, Director of Guidance and Research

for the
Depart
Conra
in the
rectio

Th
lectio
ferenc
correc
(2) a
mater
sympo
evalu
tional
a fina

Cor
shoul
300 M
ter S

Rh

A
under
and
pose
thera
child
bring
schem
Dr.
launc
three
It no
eight
eight
are r

year,
In
young
thera
appro
school
psych
three
dren
will

for the Alameda County Probation Department since 1957, and John P. Conrad, Supervisor of Classification in the California Department of Corrections since 1955.

The survey will consist of (1) collection and annotation of ideas, references, and information on current correctional practice and research, (2) analysis and organization of this material, (3) a correctional research symposium to exchange ideas and evaluate significant trends in correctional research and practice, and (4) a final report.

Communications and inquiries should be directed to Dr. Sullivan, 300 Mercantile Building, 2082 Center Street, Berkeley 4, Calif.

Rhode Island Pioneer Project

A new rehabilitation project is under way at Rhode Island's boys' and girls' training schools. Its purpose is to continue the group psychotherapy treatment of institutionalized children after their release and to bring their parents "into the therapy scheme." The project, directed by Dr. Vsevolod Sadovnikoff, was launched last September under a three-year federal grant of \$75,000. It now involves only eight boys and eight girls between thirteen and eighteen, but when these two groups are released, as units, sometime this year, others will take their place.

In the institution, the selected youngsters meet for group psychotherapy sessions twice a week. This approach is not new: both training schools have been conducting group psychotherapy sessions for the last three years. However, after the children have been released, the groups will continue to meet regularly in

some central place for about two years. Dr. Sadovnikoff and his assistant hope that this will "serve as a rallying point, an island of safety where arising problems can be discussed freely with people who are familiar and not threatening."

Meanwhile the third member of the team, a psychiatric social worker, is visiting the children's parents. The staff hope that eventually the parents themselves will agree to participate in regular group psychotherapy sessions or in some other kind of informal gathering. They also plan to do educational work in the community about "the need to understand" delinquents. They look upon themselves as "go-betweens and buffers" between the training school inmates, their parents, and the community at large.

Manuscripts Wanted

The Dixie Publishing Company, a new publishing concern in Tallahassee, Fla., is planning to handle books on criminology, social work, and general social problems. The general editor of this section, to whom manuscripts should be submitted for consideration, is Vernon Fox, Chairman, Criminology and Corrections, School of Social Welfare, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

NCSW

The National Conference on Social Welfare will hold its 87th Annual Forum in Atlantic City, N. J., June 5-10. Its theme is "The 1960's—Social Welfare Responds to a New Era." Fifty-four national organizations—among them, NPPA—are taking part in the planning.

William L. Mitchell, Commissioner of Social Security, will address a general session to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Social Security Act. Chester Bowles, Connecticut congressman and former U. S. Ambassador to India, will speak on "The International Responsibilities of the U.S. in the Decade Ahead"; Charles Frankel, Professor of Philosophy at Columbia University, will speak on "The Role of Values in Today's World and the Decade Ahead."

Three prominent social welfare workers will receive awards at the Annual Forum. They are Loula Dunn, Director of the American Public Welfare Association, for her leadership in developing the Association's effectiveness; Helen Hall, Director of the Henry Street Settlement, New York City, for her contribution to better living conditions for families and to the prevention of juvenile delinquency; and Ralph H. Blanchard, Executive Director of United Community Funds and Councils of America, for his work in establishing the National Health and Welfare Retirement Association for employees of health and welfare agencies.

For further information and room reservation forms, write to the National Conference on Social Welfare, 22 West Gay Street, Columbus 15, Ohio.

The theme of the Tenth International Conference of Social Work, to be held in Rome from January 8-14, 1961, is "Social Work—Its Function and Responsibilities in a Changing World." For details, write to Joe R. Hoffer, Secretary General, ICSW, 345 East 46 St., New York 17, N. Y.

Capital Punishment

Donal E. J. MacNamara, President of the American League to Abolish Capital Punishment and Dean of the New York Institute of Criminology, recently spoke before the Virginia legislature in support of a bill to abolish the death penalty. He put his case succinctly: capital punishment is morally wrong and criminologically unsound. It may involve irredeemable miscarriages of justice. The nine American states that have abolished the death penalty have capital crime rates lower than in states which retain it as a "deterrent" and have fewer assaults on and killings of police officers. Capital punishment, he said, has been differentially and inconsistently applied: since 1930 more than half of those executed have been persons of minority groups and a disproportionately high percentage of them have been defended by court-appointed lawyers.

National Jail Association

The National Jail Association held its fourteenth regional jail forum in New York City on February 16 and 17.

Among the subjects discussed by over 300 members and delegates were "The Jail and the Overall Correctional Program," "The Community's Stake in Its Jails," "Functions and Value of a State Jail Inspection Service," "Good Jails Everywhere—a Challenge to the Sheriffs of America," "Women's Concern in Their Local Jail," "What Should Constitute Minimum Jail Standards?" and "Correctional Programs for Jail Inmates."

In her welcoming remarks to the delegates and members, Mrs. Anna

M. Kross, Commissioner of the New York City Department of Correction, emphasized the importance of the Association's work. "All of those arrested start their travels from the local county jail and continue on to the other correctional areas." According to the latest F.B.I. report, she said, "there were only 205,643 sentenced prisoners in the federal and state penitentiaries at the end of 1958. But nowhere is there any indication in this statistical bulletin of the number of sentenced prisoners on hand in the local county jails for that period. Estimates have been made that over several million people, at some time or other during the year, passed through the gates of the country's local county jails where they were held for trial and court disposition and have served short periods of time for commission of trivial offenses."

Orthopsychiatric Association

At its annual meeting in Chicago, on February 25, the American Orthopsychiatric Association elected as president Dr. William S. Langdorf, professor of clinical psychiatry at Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons and director of the Pediatric Psychiatric Clinic of Babies Hospital, Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center. Dr. Fritz Redl was named president-elect, to take office in 1961. Dr. Redl, former chief of the child research branch of the National Institute of Mental Health, is now on leave from his position as professor of behavioral sciences at Wayne State University and is at the Center for the Advanced Study of Behavioral Sciences in California.

APTO

Typical teen-age crime is "a sordid business" and the typical delinquent is an "unsavory character," said Louis Ernst, Assistant District Attorney for Brooklyn, to a meeting of the Association for the Psychiatric Treatment of Offenders. He continued: "They are not poor dear misunderstood darlings by any stretch of my imagination. I would like to see the day when all treatable offenders will have psychiatric help, but it will take a toughminded, realistic psychiatry, operating within the framework of the law, to be effective. The sob-sister approach will not accomplish much."

At the same meeting Justice John E. Cone, of the State Supreme Court and a member of APTO's board of directors, gave facts and figures on traffic in guns, ammunition, and switchblade knives; he said that "until traffic in weapons and ammunition is brought under strict control, we won't begin to have a prevention program." "Do you know," he asked, "that with all that is said and written about youthful violence, any gang member can buy ammunition for his home-made zip gun for a penny, with no questions asked, and that this is legal?"

Church Report on Divorce

A Report to the Churches on *Marriage and Divorce in New York State* was issued in September, 1959, by the Social Service Department of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County, N.Y. It reviews New York State laws and practices and the recommendations of recent studies, and presents denominational statements

and the "personal attitudes" of the 104 clergymen who answered its questionnaire.

"Some [Protestant churches] acknowledge no grounds for divorce, some accept adultery as the only grounds, many judge divorce as sinful but treat divorced persons with forgiveness. The majority of churches appear to take the latter point of view."

The 34-page study summarizes some points from Joint Legislative Committee reports in 1957 and 1958: "In the 1940 U.S. Census, approximately one and one-half million men and women reported their marital status as divorced, and in 1950, the number was doubled! In 1939, adultery was the ground for divorce in 3.5 per cent of the matrimonial actions throughout the U.S.A., as against 100 per cent in New York State." In New York State annulment has taken the place of divorce "as the method of severing the family relationship"; most other states "permit from three to seven legal bases for bringing action for divorce." The summary refers to "the long history of fraud, collusion, and perjury in New York State in obtaining evidence for divorce by adultery and in obtaining annulments."

The Report to the Churches makes a number of recommendations to ministers, to the Council of Churches, and to the state. It suggests to ministers that they conduct two or more premarital counseling sessions with each couple they marry (101 of those answering the questionnaire said they do give some form of premarital counseling) and that they seek revisions in the state laws on divorce and annulment (most of those who expressed opinions on the subject be-

lieved the annulment laws should be more strict and the divorce laws more liberal). The recommendations to the state range from the suggestion that the form of the marriage license be streamlined, avoiding unnecessary repetition and leaving sufficient space for names and addresses, to the suggestion that a family court with professionally staffed conciliation services be set up. Its final suggestion is that "strenuous efforts" should be made "to achieve uniform divorce and annulment laws in all states."

Narcotics Bibliography

Narcotics—a List of Recent References, compiled by Dorothy C. Tompkins, is available through the Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley (\$1). It brings up to date the bibliography prepared for the California Senate Interim Committee on Treatment of Mental Illness in February, 1958. References are listed under "Youthful Addicts," "Treatment of Narcotic Addiction," "State Programs for Narcotic Control" (with special sections on California and New York), "Federal Programs for Narcotic Control," "Canadian Program for Narcotic Control," and "Bibliographies."

Thank You!

An encouraging response to our plea for a voluntary increase in membership dues is coming through daily from our professional associates. Our deep appreciation for your willingness to share this responsibility.

HARRIOT KEITH
Business Manager, NPPA

•

[E]
below
lines
noun
Midw
and I
nue,

Ca
fare a
from
famil
carcer
social
work
\$6,75
to W
ica, 3
13, C

Gr
respo
of a
discip
and f
selors
of ps
6 uni
and c
of pa
work
(b) 1
prob
offen
in ps
Salary
Diego
Person
Diego

Dis
Minis
perien
institu
bert C
of C
mingt

Employment Opportunities

[Employment opportunities not included below because of JOURNAL publication deadlines are described in a mimeographed announcement available at request from the Midwestern office of the National Probation and Parole Association, 1536 Vincennes Avenue, Chicago Heights, Illinois.]

Los Angeles, California

Casework Specialist, private social welfare agency dealing with persons released from penal institutions and with their families; group treatment of wives of incarcerated men, etc. Graduate degree in social work and paid experience in casework. Salary to \$7,548; starting salary to \$6,756, depending on qualifications. Write to Walter C. Hart, Volunteers of America, 333 S. Los Angeles St., Los Angeles 13, Calif.

San Diego, California

Group Counselor II, Juvenile Hall, responsible for orientation and supervision of a unit of juveniles, for maintaining discipline and writing behavior reports, and for instruction of new Group Counselors I. Bachelor's degree with 12 units of psychology and/or sociology (up to 6 units of education may be substituted), and one of the following: (a) one year of paid experience in casework or group work in a county probation department, (b) 18 months' similar experience with problem or neglected children or adult offenders, (c) one year of graduate study in psychology, sociology, or social work. Salary, \$5,004 to \$6,084. Write to San Diego Department of Civil Service and Personnel, Room 403 Civic Center, San Diego, Calif.

Delaware

Director of State Board of Corrections. Minimum of 15 years' training and experience in administration of correctional institutions. Salary, \$12,000. Write to Robert G. Hackett, Chairman, State Board of Corrections, Greenbank Road, Wilmington 8, Del.

Hawaii

Probation and Parole Officers and Social Workers, male, for state courts and Department of Social Services. One year of experience in probation, parole, or social work and completion of two years of graduate social work training; or any equivalent combination of experience and training, but in any case, a minimum of a bachelor's degree. Salary, \$5,328. Write to Recruiting and Examination Division, Department of Personnel Services, 825 Mililani St., Honolulu 13, Hawaii.

Peoria, Illinois

Director, Youth Farm, Inc., for maximum of 35 semi-delinquent boys. Starting salary, \$6,500, including full maintenance for director and family. For further information write to Robert W. Emmons, Chairman of Personnel Committee, 501 East Gift Ave., Peoria, Ill.

Pontiac, Michigan

Assistant Director of Child Care Institutions for Oakland County; for a detention home for about 180 children, with shelter facilities for neglected children and a cusodial program for delinquents; staff of 75, not counting 11 teachers. B.A. with major in sociology or psychology and at least one year of experience in a child care institution. Salary range, \$5,700 to \$6,300, or depending on qualifications. Write to William A. Moulton, Jr., Director of Child Care Institutions, 2050 North Telegraph, Pontiac, Mich.

St. Louis, Missouri

Deputy Chief Probation Officer. Salary, \$7,500.

Probation Officer. Salary, \$5,000.

Both positions are in the St. Louis Circuit Court for Criminal Causes. Bachelor's degree required; graduate training in social work and experience in correctional field preferred. Examination on

April 23. Write to Charles Mann, Chief Probation Officer, Room 329, Municipal Courts Building, St. Louis 3, Mo.

Newark, New Jersey

Assistant Executive Director, Essex County Youth House, detention home for 105 delinquent boys and girls under 18. M.S.W. and 5 years' experience in detention or related work. Salary, \$6,144 to \$8,044; starting salary dependent on qualifications and experience. Write to Clarence J. Wallace, Executive Director, Essex County Youth House, 70 Duryee Street, Newark 3, N.J.

White Plains, New York

Supervising Probation Officer, Westchester County Probation Department; fifth supervising position, in charge of 5 workers with small caseloads of delinquent children and family cases. Two years' graduate training in social work and supervisory experience. Salary, \$6,880 to \$8,840 in five annual steps; many benefits. Write to Raymond C. Rieger, Director of Probation, County of Westchester, 307 County Office Bldg., White Plains, N.Y.

Pennsylvania

Director of Individual Services, Pennsylvania Training School, cottage plan for delinquent girls and boys between 12 and 18; to be responsible for administration of casework, health psychology, and psychiatric services. M.S.W. or five years' experience in social work, two of which must have been in supervision or administration. Salary, \$6,716 to \$8,580, in five steps. Write to James Lamb, Superintendent, Pennsylvania Training School, 325 Curry Hill Road, Canonsburg, Pa.

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Director, Casework Services, juvenile court; responsible for staff and program development and for direction of child welfare service. M.S.W. and 3 years of supervisory experience. Starting salary, \$9,600.

Supervisor, Casework Services, juvenile court, responsible for casework of 6 probation officers. M.S.W., 3 years' casework, one year supervision experience. Salary, \$5,772 to \$7,368.

Juvenile Probation Officer II. M.S.W. and 2 years' casework experience. Salary, \$5,224 to \$6,684.

Juvenile Probation Officer I. M.S.W. or bachelor's degree and 2 years' casework experience. Salary, \$4,752 to \$5,772.

Apply to C. Boyd McDivitt, Chief Probation Officer, Allegheny County Juvenile Court, 3333 Forbes Ave., Pittsburgh 13, Pa.

York, Pennsylvania

Probation Officers (2), for juvenile division of county probation department. College degree with specialization in social sciences plus (a) two years' social work experience or (b) one year of such experience and one year in certified graduate school of social work or (c) master's degree in social work. Salary, \$4,500 to \$5,000. Write to Henry Lenz, York County Probation Department, Court House, York, Pa.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Probation Officer, municipal and district courts probation department. M.S.W. or satisfactory completion of two years' graduate training in school of social work and one year of paid social work experience. Salary, \$5,464 to \$6,423. For further information write to Anthony P. Romano, Chief Examiner, Milwaukee County Civil Service Commission, Room 206, Courthouse, Milwaukee 3, Wisc.

Book Reviews

New Horizons in Criminology, Harry Elmer Barnes and Negley K. Teeters. Pp. 654. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice Hall, Third Edition, 1959, \$7.95.

Academic criminology has known no shortage of text material, particularly on the elementary level. The first edition of Barnes and Teeters' *New Horizons in Criminology* appeared in 1943. Since that time it has gone through several revisions, as have several of the other standard books in the field. This third edition of *New Horizons in Criminology* represents a major improvement over all of its earlier editions. First, there has been a reduction in the number of pages (from 887 to the present 654). In spite of this fact, the authors have added a good deal of material on current philosophy and practice, making it a far more usable and encyclopedic coverage of the correctional field.

As in previous editions, the '59 *New Horizons in Criminology* is organized into two books. "Crime and the Criminal" and "Penal and Correctional Procedures" are the major divisions. The early sections of the book are concerned with an analysis of crime in America, theories and factors in crime, causation of criminal behavior, and criminal justice in action. The second part, which in earlier editions was titled "Penology," reflects today's more progressive thinking in its terminology and substitutes "correctional" for the discarded term. This latter part of the book is divided into four sections: ancient and medieval concepts of treating the offender, the era of reform, the rehabilitative process within the framework of imprison-

ment, and the resocialization of the offender in the community.

One cannot help but be impressed with the vast accumulation of data which Drs. Barnes and Teeters have compassed within the covers of this book. Yet in spite of the voluminous data, the authors have maintained a high degree of readability throughout. The only unfortunate matter in this regard appears to be the authors' propensity to editorialize or to use invective when perhaps calmer words with empirical substantiation might be in order. On the other hand, however, the fact that the authors do take a strong and identifiable position is one of the major strengths of this book. The reader, as he passes through the exciting story of crime in America, can have no doubt that the authors feel strongly the futility of outmoded correctional practices. One can feel their resentment at the miscarriages of justice which prevail as a consequence of trial by newspaper or by personal ambitions of prosecutors and other members of the community. For the less sophisticated, the authors paint a clear picture of high-handed tactics and illegal or extralegal methods which intimidate, threaten, or bully suspected criminals and thereby obtain convictions. One would wonder from these pages whether anyone stands the chance of a fair, honest trial.

One of the disappointing aspects of *New Horizons* is its failure to provide some usable theory of the causation of criminal behavior. Such a lack is not unique to this text: it is typical of all. The format by which each of the often quoted theories—geography, economics, sociology, minority ten-

sions, home and community influences—is presented emphasizes each equally, and thus leaves the student without a final conviction as to cause. It may not be the function of a book such as this to espouse a single cause wholeheartedly, but rather to report scientifically and accurately each of the many theories which have been advanced as a cause of crime. This it does extremely well.

References cited throughout the book have been brought up to date, and the material throughout appears to reflect the current correctional emphasis. It is regrettable that the publisher did not retain the chronology of significant steps in the evolution of correction which, in the previous edition, appeared on the inside covers, for it did help the student recognize movement within the field. Perhaps a subsequent edition will repeat that feature.

CHARLES L. NEWMAN

Director, Division of Correctional Training, Raymond A. Kent School of Social Work, University of Louisville

The Prison Community, Donald Clemmer. Pp. 341. New York, Rinehart, 1958, \$3.

The Prison Community, written by Donald Clemmer, should be read by every serious careerist in the correctional field. Back of the book is Clemmer the student, the correctional worker of wide experience, and the man with demonstrated practical ability. While it is true he gathered the material for the book many years ago and before he gained his wealth of experience, it is still a book full of material today's correctional worker needs to know about.

That many may not agree with some of the things Clemmer says or con-

cludes is no reason to say the book isn't well worth reading. In fact, a book with which you can agree and disagree—with which you can say "Amen!" to some parts and "No, sir!" to others—is apt to stir up your interest and make good reading. This is that kind of book.

The Prison Community makes no attempt to tell how a prison should be run, what causes prison riots, or when a prisoner should be released on parole.

It does, however, provide some colorful descriptions of the communities and the cultures from which prisoners come. Nowhere else will you find such well-painted word pictures. The chapter "Composition of the Penal Population" is short, but good. You will find interesting, also, the other chapters, on such topics as organization of the penitentiary, social groups, social relations, leadership phenomena, social controls, the dominant group and social control, social implications of leisure time, sexual patterns, social significance of labor, and culture and the determination of attitudes.

It is regrettable that Mr. Clemmer could not have made revisions through new research, as times have changed since the work first appeared. There are certain shortcomings to the text, the prime one being that Mr. Clemmer reports on only *one* prison community and, unfortunately, on a prison located in a state where politics interferes. The prison community used in the study had a two-man cell system, and this created, or at least intensified, problems not present to the same degree in one-man cell prisons.

I like to think that more progress has been made through the years than the author suggests. You will find it

hard
inma
tha
empl
and
priso
be ha
you l
perso

Yo
use
servi
use
the p
priso
mer c
may

Exc
priso
group
ago. T
less in
flower
and e
seling
is abo
spite
alized
interes
traini
And s
among
but ha
pattern

If th
tic, let
105 ric
ican p

By
shoul
edge,
tion
many
some,
others
sol"

Ward

hard to agree that it is common for inmates to "hate all prison officials," that it's fairly common for prison employees to want to whip prisoners and even to see them die. That a prison person is unsalvageable may be hard for you to agree with, after you have seen many institutionalized persons adjust well on the outside.

You may well believe that more use of merit systems, extended in-service training programs, and greater use of professional staff have made the prison of today a far cry from the prison of the 1930's that Mr. Clemmer describes. On the other hand, you may agree with the author that:

Except in a few bright new institutions, prisoners today tend to affiliate in informal group life much as they did twenty years ago. The prison world is drab and graceless in spite of the television sets and flowers on the campus. There is monotony and even stupor, in spite of group counseling and psychotherapy. Homosexuality is about as prevalent now as of old, in spite of classes in sex education and liberalized visiting. By and large, there is disinterest in work, in spite of vocational training and occupational aptitude tests. And so on. The improvements suggested among sixty per cent of prisons are real but have been only in degree, for the old patterns continue.

If this evaluation may appear pessimistic, let it be recorded that there have been 105 riots or serious disturbances in American prisons since 1950.

By all means, this is a book you should read. It will give you knowledge, understanding, and an appreciation of factors in prison life which many have overlooked. It will, to some, give an excuse to disagree; to others, a chance to say, "I told you so!"

JOHN C. BURKE

Warden, Wisconsin State Prison

Youth Groups in Conflict, Mary E. Blake. Pp. 52. Washington, D.C., U.S. Children's Bureau, 1958, \$.25.

Reaching the Unreached Family, Marion Smith Shute. Pp. 54. New York, New York City Youth Board, 1958, free.

To those who know the delinquent it is a truism that his activities nearly always occur as a product of group involvement. One boy out of doors at night is usually on his way home. A gang of boys will be looking for adventure—exciting things to do which adults may call delinquency. The gang may then become delinquent although the individuals in the gang are privately shivering in their boots.

Juvenile delinquency is a serious and a growing American problem. Every year, more of our children are getting into trouble with the law. No one cause can produce delinquency, and there is no one solution.

We do know, however, that man is the product of the social milieu, that gang life, like home life, can be of vital importance in the building of character. It is no wonder then that group workers soon found a need to use their skills in helping gang boys accept new social mores.

Youth Groups in Conflict recounts the proceedings of the U. S. Children's Bureau national conference on work with hostile youth groups. Mary E. Blake, group worker and community services consultant for the Bureau, has done an excellent reporting job as editor. Consequently, this 52-page book is an excellent reference work for group workers and for probation officers as well.

The conference concluded that to work effectively with a hostile group one must understand and appreciate

the experiences of which their lives are a product. This is not a one-time thing gained from reading a book, but rather a continuous process. Therefore, the worker's personality and talents become of first importance in the treatment process. "The worker is not a paratrooper letting himself down into ugly uncertainty," said the conference. His success is based upon his skill, plus his hours of personal association with the group, plus his resulting understanding of it.

The more that is learned about what makes delinquents behave the way they do, the more obvious becomes the importance of primary contacts. In the gang the peers exert their influence, and in the home, each member of the family plays his role. The child learns about individual rights and the rules of fair play from his siblings, but his parents must supply love, care, guidance, and security.

In its work with delinquents the New York City Youth Board soon found that if it was to do an effective preventive job it must reach troubled children and their families when disturbance was obvious. It was relatively simple to find the problem children but problem families did not seem to want agency help. Hence the Youth Board created a new agency, Service to Families and Children. Mrs. Marion Smith Shute tells the new agency's story objectively in a 54-page monograph titled *Reaching the Unreached Family*. Seventy-five per cent of the parents studied were found to be failing in their role as fathers and mothers. A high proportion of the parents suffered from serious physical disability and were incompatible. Problem parents produced problem

children, was the Youth Board conclusion.

A similar Family Centered Project has operated in St. Paul for the past five years, with my Probation Department as one of the seven cooperating agencies. Both FCP and SFC have pursued similar courses, reaching out to problem families with better housing, medical and dental care, housekeeping facilities, child guidance, vocational or marital counseling, and other special tools. Social workers learned to be more open and direct with their clients, to be more patient, to put emphasis on motivation, and to keep the work family-centered.

This is an important book which offers hope for families that are usually unreached. It presents a challenge to social work which must be met with family-centered casework.

Early referrals by the police and courts will increase the possibility of family salvage and may prevent sibling delinquency. Special emphasis in schools of social work will provide trained family-centered treatment staff.

The library of every school of social work should contain both of these important publications. *Reaching the Unreached Family* should be a "must" in the in-service training of probation officers, caseworkers with family agencies, and all group workers. One hopes that the New York Youth Board will produce another fine monograph in this important series relating to its work.

JOHN K. DONOHUE

Chief Probation Officer, Ramsey County (Minn.) Probation Department

W
Ex-p
rec
Pp.
socia
1959
T
Rese
voted
of o
tions
New
oners
techn
TH
of q
comp
"Wh
ready
"Wh
oppo
are t
tentia
ex-pr
disab
and
"Wh
to th
"Wh
ion c
oners
adjust
plicat
prison
prove
parole
What
progr
port
emplo
can b
prison
pre-pa
dures?
to reh
a man
The
day m

What's New in the Employment of Ex-prisoners, Albert Morris, ed. (*Correctional Research*, Bulletin No. 9.) Pp. 41. Boston, United Prison Association of Massachusetts, November, 1959.

The entire issue of *Correctional Research* for November, 1959, is devoted to problems of the employment of offenders, and their possible solutions. As suggested by the title, *What's New in the Employment of Ex-prisoners*, it is about new approaches and techniques.

The subheads (mainly in the form of questions) give an idea of the comprehensiveness of the bulletin: "What happens when a prisoner ready for release can't get a job?" "What factors affect the employment opportunities of ex-prisoners?" "What are the policies and practices of potential employers with reference to ex-prisoners?" "What effect do legal disabilities have on the employment and social adjustment of parolees?" "What about bonding as an obstacle to the employment of ex-prisoners?" "What are the effects of public opinion on the employment of ex-prisoners?" "What problems of personal adjustment to community life complicate the employment prospects of ex-prisoners?" "What can be done to improve the employment possibilities of parolees and ex-prisoners in general? What is being done?" "Experimental programs for gaining community support and cooperation in obtaining employment for ex-prisoners." "What can be done for the short-term jail prisoner?" "What is being done with pre-parole transitional release procedures?" and "The basic prerequisite to rehabilitation: Public support of a man's right to work while in prison."

The bulletin originated in a one-day meeting for potential employers

of released prisoners and for labor union leaders, arranged by the United Prison Association of Massachusetts, in cooperation with the Massachusetts Department of Corrections, and held in May, 1959, at the Massachusetts Correctional Institution at Walpole. The meeting of people from industry and labor with correctional workers, the state labor and industry staff, and the parole board provided an opportunity for an exchange of ideas. It clarified such points as the following: who the offender is; what the institutions are doing to prepare offenders for employment and community living; what problems are encountered in placing offenders on jobs; the attitudes of employers, labor unions, and bonding companies toward offenders; and what employers expect of offender-employees.

A parolee who participated described the difficulties he had had in job finding and personal adjustment. Then the visitors went on a tour of the institution to have a first-hand look at men under vocational training and engaged in prison industry.

Only a small portion of the bulletin actually pertains to the Massachusetts meeting. When preparing the bulletin the editor sent letters to the chairmen of the parole boards of the fifty states, to a sample of prisoners' aid associations, and to the personnel managers of some two hundred Massachusetts business firms representing the major occupational areas. The bulletin quotes points from various replies.

Thus, much of the material for the bulletin comes from those actually working in the field. Prof. Morris has made use of many articles and publications, gathering in one place a wealth of information on common problems encountered in placing of-

fenders on jobs, and possible techniques and methods to meet them. He has also included a bibliography of about fifty articles and publications, which would be extremely helpful to anyone wishing to study the subject intensively.

In addition to his excellent coverage of the problem in the adult state correctional institutions, the editor gives a good account of the situation in the county jails.

Although, as he explains, limited time and funds prevented him from covering the subject fully and systematically, *What's New in the Employ-*

ment of Ex-prisoners is an excellent basic resource for anyone who wants to do something about the problem. I strongly recommend it for use by parole boards, prisoners' aid societies, and citizens' organizations. It was extremely helpful in both the planning and the conference stages of the Governor's Conference on the Employment of Offenders held in Seattle, Washington, on February 18-19 (referred to in pages 132-137 of this issue).

JOSEPH R. ROWAN
Consultant, NPPA Washington Citizens Council

DETENTION PRACTICE

Significant Developments in the Detention of Children and Youth

55 outstanding programs in 23 institutions

plans—photographs

publication date: April 25

about 256 pp.

\$2.50

Order now from

NATIONAL PROBATION AND PAROLE ASSOCIATION

*Reprints of some articles in this issue of the NPPA JOURNAL
and of articles selected from previous issues will be available
soon. The list of titles and prices will be published in the
July issue.*

7th Annual
NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

Muehlebach Hotel

Kansas City, Mo.

May 1-4, 1960

sponsored by

National Probation and Parole Association

Central States Corrections Association

Kansas Probation and Parole Association • Missouri Corrections Association

Theme: "Crime Control—Fact vs. Fancy"

General Sessions

Current Thinking on Crime Causation

Critique of Control and Treatment Methods

Religion's Stake in Delinquency Prevention

Report on Saginaw Probation Demonstration Project

38 Panels and Workshops

Evaluation of Selected Correctional Concepts • The Female Offender • The Use of Foster Homes for Delinquents • Performance Budgeting in Correctional Agencies • On-the-Job Training • Professional Ethics • etc.

for staff in law enforcement, institutions, detention, prisoners' aid, probation and parole (field and board members); judges, chaplains, administrators, supervisors, caseworkers

Prevention • Treatment

Administration • Community Relations • Interrelated Services

UENCY

1-4, 1960

sociation

er • The
eting in
s • etc.

d parole
eworkers

ervices

*We
have
changed
our
name...*

We've changed
from: National Probation
to: National Council on

to reflect more accurately
our interest and activity
as a standard-setting and field-service agency
working for the prevention, control, and treatment
of crime and delinquency.

Only the *name* has changed, *not the program*.

Probation and parole will continue to receive major emphasis
as the most effective and economical means
for dealing with the great majority of offenders.

The old name was restrictive; it did not show that the agency
was involved in many aspects of the crime and delinquency problem
aside from probation and parole. It did not suggest our work
in the following, for example:

the Citizen Action Program (since 1954)
judicial leadership (through the Advisory Council of Judges
since 1953)
standard legislation and legal advisory service
detention and correctional facilities and services
professional training institutes
library and information services
our new research and information clearing center on crime
and delinquency
a nation-wide study of the youthful offender problem
participation in state and regional conferences and (since 1954)
co-sponsorship of the annual National Institute on Crime
and Delinquency

ed
ion
on

our name and Parole Association Crime and Delinquency

ment

Since June 17, 1907, when the
National Probation Officers' Association was organized,
we have grown from a group of fourteen officers
to a national service agency with 25,000 members and a
professional staff serving the nation from four regional offices.

sis

We are confident that, under its new name,
the agency will continue to grow in prestige and in its contribution
to the public welfare.

cy
problem
rk

For the record . . .
the new name was proposed and authorized by the membership
at the annual business meeting in Swampscott, Mass.,
on June 3, 1959;
was approved by the Board of Trustees on
March 21, 1960;
was ratified by the membership at the
annual business meeting in Kansas City, Mo., on
May 3, 1960;
and became official when the certificate of change of name
was filed in the office of the
Secretary of State in Albany, N. Y., on
May 24, 1960.

es

ne

1954)
e

Business going on as usual
under the new name

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

at the old stand

1790 Broadway, New York 19
530 Littlefield Building, Austin 15, Texas
1536 Vincennes Avenue, Chicago Heights, Ill.
821 Market Street, San Francisco 3

In accord with the agency's change of name,
the name of the quarterly has been changed

from NPPA JOURNAL

to CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

and the name of the bimonthly has been changed

from NPPA NEWS

to NCCD NEWS

Vo

TH

SO
We
the
great
of w
feet
four
out-c
more
the
down
quies
the
midc
arou
from
she
was
red
two
in th

• P
Instit
Unive
Work
tinue